

5-2009

Unconventional Means: Technology and Resistance in the Emergence of Three Forms of New Media

Caroline Stone

Clemson University, cstoneclemson@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses

 Part of the [Mass Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stone, Caroline, "Unconventional Means: Technology and Resistance in the Emergence of Three Forms of New Media" (2009). *All Theses*. 548.

https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/all_theses/548

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact kokeefe@clemson.edu.

UNCONVENTIONAL MEANS: TECHNOLOGY AND RESISTANCE
IN THE EMERGENCE OF THREE FORMS OF NEW MEDIA

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate School of
Clemson University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
Professional Communication

by
Caroline Hubbard Stone
May 2009

Accepted by:
Dr. Jan Holmevik, Committee Chair
Dr. Cynthia Haynes
Dr. Lee Morrissey
Dr. Jonathan Field

ABSTRACT

The media change we currently witness, the numbers of newspapers that have recently folded, those that face a similar fate, and the degree to which the death of print generally is predicted within and outside of academic circles, all call for more research into shifts in forms of media over time. From the first American colonial newspaper *Publick Occurrences* in 1690 in Boston, to the first punk rock zine *Punk* in New York City in 1975, to the emergence of the massively multi-player game *World of Warcraft* in 2004, understanding the factors that may have led to the emergence of new forms of media over time offers an alternative perspective from which to understand digital forms of media that are often referred to as if they will always be ‘new media.’ This thesis attempts to work historically against these type of neophilic claims for today’s forms of digital media and methodologically in a consideration of the degree to which technology influences the emergence of new forms of media. Each of these cases suggest a dynamic in which agency is shared between the tools and actors in given situations rather than, as those who argue for models of change more similar to technological determinism would suggest, a dynamic in which actors serve technological forms. Actors in each of these situations used the available tools, from the printing press to the computer’s graphical user interface, to resist perceived impossibilities. We risk losing the possibility of our own agency in models of our relationship to technological forms if we lose sight of these histories of forms of media; we risk losing the stories of actors who used unconventional means to attempt to enact change. And, most importantly, we risk complacency, as the digital divide promises to make literacy ever more difficult for subjects to achieve.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank to my committee members for their generosity throughout this process. My thanks go to Dr. Cynthia Haynes for her warmth, hospitality and wisdom during our meetings and the evenings that she and Jan invited groups of graduate students into their home to introduce us to virtual worlds. I would like to thank Dr. Jan Holmevik for his patience and instruction as the chair of my committee and for challenging me as a student in his visual communications class to begin to study massively multi-player games. My project would not have been possible without the time I spent in Dr. Jonathan Field's Piracy and Print Culture creative inquiry. He has been a constant source of guidance, valuable insight, and tireless encouragement during my time at Clemson. I would like to thank him for inviting me to enter an early-American discourse community, or, in other words, for inviting me to join Cotton Mather's posse. My thanks go to Dr. Lee Morrissey for asking that I become a close reader and for allowing me to have a seat at the table in his graduate reading hours and theory colloquiums. His classes, particularly his States of Exception creative inquiry, inspired my interest in modal shifts. I have been privileged to have the opportunity to learn from him.

I would like to thank Patrick Neal for being a lover of big ideas and specifically for his lecture, in his Introduction to Journalism course, on convergence and the history of the newspaper in America.

I owe a debt of thanks to John Holmstrom for generously allowing me to interview him.

Thanks go to David Mercer for sharing his experiences within *World of Warcraft* and allowing me to include them in this work.

My heartfelt thanks go to my father Gerald Stone for challenging me to take up difficult tasks and for supporting my time at Clemson.

For allowing me to grow up in a home that valued literacy I thank my mother Mary Lea Stone. To my grandmother Lea Robinson who, as far back as I can remember, has clipped newspaper articles for her brother in New York and has recycled her magazines by sending them to my mother's house, I dedicate this thesis.

Finally, my thanks go to Michael, who taught me to run projection, and whose curiosity and strength inspire me daily.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. METHODOLOGY	16
III. AN EMERGENCE OF COLONIAL NEW MEDIA	31
IV. YOU DIRTY <i>PUNK</i> : THE EMERGENCE OF THE PUNK ROCK ZINE IN NEW YORK, 1975	47
V. A QUEST INTO EMERGENT MASSIVELY MULTI-PLAYER ONLINE MEDIA.....	72
VI. CONCLUSION	89
WORKS CITED.....	99
WORKS CONSULTED.....	104

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In the more than 300 years since the first colonial American newspaper was published, the speed of media change in America and around the world has rapidly increased to the point that, as Guy Debord suggests, we now more than ever risk naively succumbing to a hypnotic belief in “a world without memory” (Debord 14). On one level then, this project has been my personal attempt to return to memory and inform my daily experiences in a media-saturated landscape. In this sense, my three examples of once-emergent forms of media—the colonial newspaper, the punk rock zine and the massively multi-player online game, are each here because I have something at stake. My interest in independent print publications began during my undergraduate studies when I worked for the college newspaper. When our publication fought against a form of censorship through the purse—the schools’ governing board threatened to reduce funding sharply after we began publishing campus arrest reports—and subsequently chose to let go of these university funds, I did not know that one interpretive frame for that situation, the resistance to censorship and government control of printed speech, included a newspaper published in Boston in 1690. Today I work full-time as a design and copy editor at a local daily newspaper, and on a daily basis, it seems, there are internal and external discussions about the future of this medium and predictions that the paper product will eventually shift exclusively to the Internet.

My interest in the punk rock zine began simply by occupying an office next-door to the college’s radio station during my graduate assistantship and becoming aware of

debates on whether punk rock was or was not dead. I became more interested in independent music publications after learning that *Rolling Stone* had been for some time owned by Vivendi, which owned record a number of major record labels. It seemed to me then that media ownership and, more specifically, the consolidation and convergence of forms of media were trends worth following. Among other things, *Wired* editor Chris Anderson's *The Long Tail* turned my attention toward the importance of smaller, independent forms of media that emerged to resist the monolithic production of media giants. To me, zines as self-produced, independent print publications seemed to embody a similar ethos and occupy a similar position in a niche market as the smaller bands that were beginning, in accordance with Anderson's model, to use social networking sites such as Myspace to reach new audiences successfully.

I participated in a massively multi-player game in the classroom during the first year of my graduate work. *Second Life*, perhaps more accurately described as a massively multi-player social network with an advanced graphical user interface rather than a game, seemed then to offer a new opportunity for applying Jean Baudrillard's theory of simulation. My time in *Second Life* ended with the class, but I chose to devote a chapter of my thesis to *World of Warcraft* and a discussion of the emergence of massively multi-player games after meeting several other students and professors who spent significant amounts of time in the game. One of the students, who I interviewed for the chapter, had attempted to quit playing the game three times and, though he has "cut back," currently devotes more than ten hours a week to *WoW*. Although there are cases of people who seem to have forgotten their "first lives" and become highly emotionally invested in

Second Life, I personally met more people who either played *WoW* or had emotionally absent loved ones as a result of *WoW*. Beyond the stories of others, what is at stake for me in this chapter is a chance to interrogate the possibility of resistance to the body through *WoW*, and, more broadly, the would-be seamless computer interfaces and accompanying software that structure many of our daily experiences.

I have attempted to produce a larger interpretive framework for understanding these three emergences of new forms of media that I hope allows for the possibility of resistance to the belief that we live in a world without memory. I have a sense that the dizziness induced by speed of the changes we witness has caused us to forget to situate these changes historically and to remember that what are so readily labeled as “new media” will not always be such, that we will look back on the new media of today as old and that we should remember to consider today’s old media as once new.

When we attempt to imagine the possible impacts of these new forms of media, it is often tempting to think of the relationship between the newer forms and the older forms as one of substitution and elimination, rather than addition and synthesis in which the tension between two forms would shape new emergences. Media history becomes the telling of what once existed rather than what remains in a diverse media landscape. Even those theories that allow for the possibility synthesis and thereby allow for a historical interpretation of digital forms of media, seem to give priority to these newer digital forms as being more flexible and less hierarchical. Today, proclamations of the death of the author and eulogies for the canon of literature seem to have been surpassed by declarations of the death of print.

We now risk losing, rather than a stable site of the production of meaning or the fixed limits on a grouping of texts, both of which promised to create openings for participation in production and consumption of meaning, albeit at the possible expense of a system of profit and disciplinary unity, an open site of reception to those who find themselves on the wrong side of the digital divide. This speculated death of print promises not only that what it means to be literate has changed but that the tools required to become, as Paulo Friere said, a reader of the world have been replaced by much more costly alternatives with much more limited availability.

I believe this debate grows continually more relevant. It seems fair to say that, whether it is at the hands of new media or other more systematic economic, social and political forces, the production of print is rapidly changing. From the *Atlanta Journal Constitution* to Gannett News Services, layoffs and buyouts of print employees have been widespread and deep. These changes began before what is often referred to in their pages as the current economic “meltdown,” although the industry’s cries seem to have been silenced some by the distress from many other segments of the economy.

What seems less certain are the factors that have brought about these changes in the state of print culture. There has been a tendency to attribute them to new media. Indeed, it is possible that by calling new media such, those forms of media now labeled as old are destined to be left behind. In other words, if print dies then it may be a death brought on, in part, by those who theorized it. In one sense it all depends on how we define the past. As Bruno Latour has suggested, we may never have been modern (Latour

46) If he is correct, then is impossible for us to be beyond something we have not yet become. Or we have always been beyond it. Either way, it is a question of definitions.

My project takes up the problem of defining three past shifts in forms of media in order to gain a greater level of interpretive power over the shifts we witness today. I believe that if we are able better to describe the agents of change that led to past shifts in forms of media and the degree to which this agents of change were present in different shifts over time, the categories we identify will allow us to argue with increased authority against predictions of the death of print and the neophilic tendency to describe today's forms of digital media as if they will always be new.

Although I chose *World of Warcraft* as the form of digital media to research here, I do believe that in general digital forms of media structure time in a significantly different way for the audience. The constant flows of forms of digital forms of media exist in stark contrast to the marking of days and weeks through the newspaper. In this sense, *World of Warcraft*, as a medium that is always “on” and ever-changing, may represent our shifting experiences of temporality and only heighten our risk for living in a world without memory. In other words, my concern with the death of newspapers is, in part, created by the way that the production of news works in a world increasingly structured by digital forms of media. So, it seems, I may be concerned with the death of the paper product of news, rather than the more broad news industry or profession. It is important to question, however, how much of the news we consume through digital forms of media would not be available without support from print products' advertising and subscription-based revenue.

Another central focus of my project is the problem of how we choose to describe the technological change that has run alongside these shifts in forms of media over time. Certainly, and especially today, it is impossible to completely separate a form of media from the technology that is used to produce it. My goal then, in looking at technology's relationship to these emergences of new forms of media, has been to describe technology's place in relation to these shifts without conceding it a degree of agency that necessarily outweighs other possible contributing factors.

The aim, then, of my work has been two-fold. My first goal was historical. I aimed to work against an ahistorical tendency to describe contemporary forms of media as if they will always be new. My second goal was methodological. I intentionally traced technology's relationship to the emergences of these forms of media. My work then attempts to describe a portion of media history's relationship to technology but not the history of shifts in media as the history of technological forms.

Chapter Descriptions

In chapter two, I describe my research design and methodology, which is overall a historical and theoretical approach. In this chapter, I outline my subject selection, and the ways, necessarily different in each case, that I collected additional primary source material—in the case of *Punk* I was able to interview John Holmstrom, the editor of the zine, and with *World of Warcraft* I played the game for five months and interviewed a student who had devoted years to the interface. In this chapter I also address possible directions for future research using alternate methods such as discourse analyses and

ethnographic research. Finally, in this chapter, I describe some of the limitations of my research.

In chapter three I discuss the emergence of the colonial newspaper in Boston in 1690. I consider this publication not as the first of its kind but rather the first in a given geography. In one sense this chapter is about the struggles of Benjamin Harris to escape the censorship he faced in London and his desire to publish a newspaper that led him across the ocean. Harris' story continues after his colonial newspaper *Publick Occurrences* was shut down by the Boston authorities after its first issue. He moved back to London and was able to work at a government-authorized publication. However, the differences between it and *Publick Occurrences* or the similarities between it and the newspaper in Boston which followed *Publick Occurrences* fourteen years later, *The Boston News-letter*, allow for another interpretation of the emergence of the colonial newspaper. It is possible that this resistance to government censorship and the degree to which this censorship is a perceived impossibility create the desire for a new form of colonial print. The existing print culture of Boston at the time seems to have also created the space for this emergence. Harris, in his coffee shop, and many other colonists at the time sold newspapers from abroad, pamphlets and books. Seventeenth century New England, in turn, was an unusually literate society for the time, in a location that was, to some extent, geographically isolated and not nearly as regulated as England proper or even the other colonies.

In this chapter, I apply Harris' choice to allow women into his coffee house to question Elizabeth Dillon's reworkings of Habermas' model of the public sphere in

which she argues that there was a division between a literary and a political public sphere. In *The Gender of Freedom* Dillon argues that women's position in the seventeenth century in America has typically been described as private as opposed to public. She reworks Habermas' model of the public sphere and argues for a literary public sphere, in which women were active, that constituted a political public sphere of coffee houses and newspapers, which was open only to men. We could critique this co-dependent but divided model of public sphere using Jameson's argument in the *Political Unconscious* that the political interpretation is always applicable—that “in the last analysis” everything is political (20)—and therefore it might not be possible to separate an area of literary production from a political public sphere. Additionally, and in regard to Harris' coffee house, we could critique Dillon's model by pointing out the presence, and through presence perhaps implied participation, of women in a sphere of coffee houses and the ground for newspaper production. On the other hand, one coffee house does not an entire public sphere make, but the London Coffee House and Harris' decision to open his doors to women allows us to work with Dillon's model and continue to question women's public participation.

The case of *Publick Occurrences* may show that, in Boston in 1690, the emergence of a new form of media was about clear divisions and the possibilities for speech. The coffee house as a space of public discourse that was limited, if not to women in this case, then to certain classes, the division between the authorized speech of the state and the rogue speech of Harris, and perhaps even the separation between the place of the colonists and England proper as the paper's name suggests—*Publick Occurences*,

both Foreign and Domestick—all indicate the ways in which definite thresholds dictated subjects' perceived possibilities.

With regard to the question of technology, which I take up in each of these cases, Boston was home to what was, according to Isaiah Thomas, one of the best-equipped presses in the country. The press on which *Publick Occurrences* was brought to the colonies more than sixty years before the publication emerged. This technology was hardly common in the colonies. At the time, the governor of Virginia expressed his thankfulness to God that he did not have to worry about printing or public schools in Virginia (Kobre 6).

The influence of the printing press in for the emergence of the colonial newspaper might seem to raise the question of technological determinism. In this theory a form of media does not offer subjects a powerful tool through which they could challenge ruling authority, rather a new form of media would be seen as the absolute ruling authority which controls the subjects. In one sense, my work in this thesis has been my attempt to engage with others' theories of technology and media change. In *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* book historian Elizabeth Eisenstein argues that beginning in the mid-fifteenth century in Europe the printing press was a revolutionary agent of social change.

I believe 'communications revolution' best suits my purposes in this book. Whatever label is used, it should be understood to cover a large cluster of relatively simultaneous, closely interrelated changes...the marked increase in the output of books and the drastic reduction in the number of man-hours required to turn them out deserve stronger emphasis...there is a

tendency to think of a steady increase in book production...an evolutionary model of change is applied to a situation that seems to call for a revolutionary one (233).

Although Eisenstein argues for a revolutionary as opposed to evolutionary model of change, in her model human agents, some acting as early capitalists, played a significant role. Gutenberg, Vespasiano da Bisticci, Cosimo de Medici, John Fust, and Martin Luther—these human agents are essential to her model (233-5).

Michael Warner in *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth Century America* addresses the claim that print has a “status prior to culture” (7). Print is not co-constituted by the culture from which emerged. It creates the culture after it arrives. If not from the culture, then, it would seem, from the technology of the press.

Certainly, some believe that human agency played an essential role in the emergence of print, with agents acting not only as innovators and capitalists but in a system of co-dependent cultural change. Roger Chartier describes this double natured relationship in regards to the production of an earlier form of print culture, the book. He says, “works and objects produce their social area of reception much more than they are produced by crystallized and previously existent divisions” (14). However, he notes the importance of the produced form of a work and the ability of form to determine use. Chartier argues that this importance can be seen in the changes in textual space and layout which occurred in printing between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries (11). For Chartier, meaning is made in the space between the text and the object (10). From his

line of reasoning we can conclude that as the object evolves, so changes the reader's interpreted meaning. According to Chartier when a text moves from "one form of publishing to another" a new audience is constituted (12).

This conversation, between Eisenstein, Warner, Chartier and others, could be seen as continuing into a debate about the emergence of newer forms of media. Throughout my chapters, I also consider the work Jay Bolter whose theories I employ and question to discuss the design of print products and digital interfaces.

Chapter 4 considers the first punk rock zine, *Punk*, which was published in New York City in December of 1975. This publication, from the handmade flyers three young men distributed around the city before it was printed ("watch out, punk is coming!") to the zine's coverage of the bands that played at the New York club CBGB, is credited with opening possibilities not only for a new form of print media, the self-published, handmade magazine, but also for a new genre of music. Unlike *Publick Occurrences*, there is little debate that this publication was the first of its kind and is even credited by many as naming the genre of music that it covered. The design of the publication, with hand-illustrations and hand-written interviews, may have set a standard that influenced the significant number of smaller zines that were published later in the decade and into the 1980s on punk rock.

In this chapter, I return to the question of the relationship between censorship and resistance. When the mainstream music press covered punk music, the reviews were often highly critical and dismissive, and, it seems, what some of these critics said about the genre they also said about the publication devoted to it. *Rolling Stone* wrote a piece

about *Punk* in 1976 that was, as John Holmstrom the editor of *Punk* said, “a hack job” (Holmstrom interview). I consider *Punk*’s resistance, the creators’ desire to push back against conventions and perceived impossibilities, as two-fold at least: 1) The direct and specific resistance to the other publications of the time that published unfavorable reviews of this music, and 2) the more broad cultural resistance to societal standards, a type of resistance that this publication shared with the genre. I consider the claim, by some, that punk was overtly political and the possibility that the emergence of this form could be connected with a creative drive and a desire to make something new.

Technology’s role in *Punk*, if we consider the events immediately surrounding the zine and its publication, does not seem as influential as when we consider the effect that *Punk*’s design, the aesthetic it created, may have had in combination with later publications that emerged. *Punk* was produced using offset technology by a printer Holmstrom met at CBGB’s. As Holmstrom said, “we never Xerox’d, we never mimeographed” (Holmstrom interview). However, many zines that followed *Punk* used the recent advances in photocopying technology along with hand lettering and hand-illustrations to produce a layout that mimicked *Punk*. For this emergence of a form of new media, too, I believe that geography and the importance of place cannot be ignored. For *Punk* to be successful, it depended on the ability to distribute it to a certain number of readers. In New York, Holmstrom found a group who, like the beta-tester Puritans of New England, were particularly well suited to become an audience for his publication. Although many cities may have been influential in the punk movement, from L.A. to London, CBGB’s in New York, which I consider to have served a similar function to the

coffee houses of Boston by encouraging an oral discursive network, and Holmstrom's professors in design school allowed this publication to achieve a higher level of success than it might have otherwise.

If the emergence of *Punk* is about divisions, then they are not the clear divisions of *Publick Occurrences*. Rather *Punk* had more to do with a disagreement with, and desire to gain distance from, the hippie culture of the 1960s and the mainstream music of the 1970s. In one sense, *Punk* was about shocking people out of a state of boredom. Its contract with its readers, rather than the contract of Harris' *Publick Occurrences*—to provide a “Faithful Relation” of the news—was to change readers' lives by showing them an alternate way of being in the world, as a punk.

Chapter 5 is devoted to the massively multi-player game, *World of Warcraft*. This chapter begins with a historical look at the shifts in technology that allowed the game to exist in its present form. I consider the implications that today we are able to use a graphical user interface that has surpassed Bolter's descriptions of what, for him, kept virtual reality from truly achieving transparent immediacy. In this chapter I interrogate the tendency in game studies to use theories that suggest play is separate—“man creates a second, poetic world alongside the world of nature” (Huizinga 100). I believe this theoretical separation of play into a “second world” not only reflects on the prevalent belief among the developers of massively multi-player games that it is possible to achieve a “second life,” but also it is connected to Dillon's model of the public sphere in which she separates a literary public sphere separate from the political public sphere. In this chapter I suggest that game studies would benefit from the use of a Derridian definition

of play as one way of interpreting these games. I believe this intervention follows Henry Jenkins' suggestion that the division between Huizinga's description of play, ludology, and ludology's tendency to portray the play element in narratology as limited (Jenkins 422) is a false division.

If the promise of *Publick Occurrences* was a "Faithful Relation" and the promise of *Punk* was a cultural movement, then I believe one *WoW* promise to its readers is the escape from physical reality and the body. Although I believe the desire to have this promise fulfilled, as with the promises of earlier forms of media, may be one of the factors that led to the emergence of *World of Warcraft*, it seems necessary to interrogate not only whether it is a false hope, but also its implications for how its readers interpret the time they spend interacting with the interface, the hidden labor of the programmers who create the interface, and *WoW*'s construction of gender roles that appear to be more fluid—men may play as ladies and ladies as men—while distracting players from the ways in which gender inequality is perpetuated.

Diachronic Approaches to New Media

I suggest, among other things, that in each of these situations when a new form of media emerges, human agents use the available tools, sometimes new technology and sometimes older technology in new ways, to resist perceived impossibilities. It is possible, that in each of these cases, the desire to resist perceived impossibilities is created by these available tools. Throughout this project I have attempted to offer a consideration of the conditions, beyond technology, which may have created this desire.

In each of these cases, new forms of media may have allowed subjects to gain a degree of discipline, and through that discipline, agency. One of the differences between these two print artifacts and this digital form of media is the accessibility of acquiring the means to reproduce the form of media. If subjects of digital media are being disciplined, then I believe it may risk being a discipline that perpetuates their status as users of the interface and not agents of change because the software of digital media is designed in such a way as to prevent users' authorship. In the final analysis, we should question the relationship between media change through time and subjects' chances for political action.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

By some accounts, new media, digital media, defines our contemporary existence. As professional communicators, Web design and Web editing are becoming increasingly profitable to our skill sets, communications scholars are challenged to address new media's impact—the April 2008 special issue of *Written Communication* was devoted solely to new media's impact on writing. As consumers, the changes in media guide our hands and sometimes constrain our choices—the recent conversion from cable to digital television and the recent convergence of XM and Sirius Satellite radio serve as examples here. And, finally, as citizens we probably do not see the need to turn a local Starbucks into a place of heated political discourse; instead we probably blog.

What might we miss by focusing too much on the newness of these forms of media, by not questioning the newness of new media? Wendy Hui Kyong Chun in the introduction to *New Media, Old Media* argues that the “new” in new media, a phrase that she claims has been around since the 1960s and gained wide use in the mid-90s (1) is “surprisingly uninterrogated” (3). Some also fail to challenge, it seems, the implications for “old media” attached to the use of this catch phrase.

Print journalists and communication scholars rather than decrying the “Death of the Author” now predict the death of print. Eric Altman's “Out of Print” in the March 2008 issue of *The New Yorker* delivers a eulogy for the 300-year-old American newspaper. As Manuel Castells argues in *End of Millenium*, the recent shifts in media and

the predictions for where these shifts will end are not self-limited but will as part of the information age, continue to transform the globe into a totally new environment (361).

Not everyone agrees with the extent and implications of these claims for the new status of print. R. Seth Friedman editor of *Factsheet Five*, calls those who predict the death of print “soothsayers” (13). Friedman believes that print will survive more as an art form than as a commercial endeavor. In some ways, his argument falls in line with *Wired* Editor Chris Anderson’s 2006 book *The Long Tail* in which Anderson declares that the niche markets will gradually replace consolidated markets and previous forms will continue to survive, in smaller, less corporate fashions.

In light of these recent debates over the status of print and our own status as media subjects, I believe we may be witnessing something similar to a media revolution as defined by Marxist political theorist Frederic Jameson—“a moment in which the coexistence of various modes of production [has] become visibly antagonistic” (95). If we consider the printing press and computer operating systems as different modes of production, then their coexistence is believed by some to be antagonistic. In this equation, professional communicators who, in part, have perceived ownership over the former mode of production have been vocal about the rivalry. Whether these recent arguments are spurred by fear of unrecognizable change or by a fascination with all things new, there seems to be a growing concern with the emergence of new forms of media, a belief that new media might be more different than similar to older forms of media, and a lack of understanding about the process by which new media come into existence. To attempt to understand the emergence of new media better and how these phenomena may be

connected to the emergences of older forms of media, my research questions are as follows:

Research Questions

1. What are some of the factors that may have led to the emergence of the colonial newspaper, the punk rock zine and the massively mutli-player game?
2. Are any of these factors shared? What, if any patterns, may exist with regard to the emergences of new forms of media?
3. What is the role of technology?

Although these research questions structure the focus of my chapters and allowed me to attempt to narrow my research, much of each chapter is devoted to my own interpretation of these emergences and the application and synthesis of others' theories.

Research Design

I began this project with the belief that many of these predictions of the replacement of the printed text by digital media focused too heavily on the characteristics of digital media while neglecting previous historical shifts in media that would inform contemporary theory. My argument, then, that emergences of forms of media have a history, these shifts are not the first, and my suspicion that the agents of this history would appear as players in a systemic web of partnered constitution both seemed best served by a historical, albeit limited by space and time, inquiry.

Claims for the death of print have far reaching affects, which I believe explains media ecology's interdisciplinary borrowing from a range of academic fields. My project, which I would categorize as an initial attempt at media ecology, also attempts to achieve a degree of multimodality. My research methods for each of these chapters has been restricted by my access to available archives and primary sources, but I have attempted to supplement these archives, when possible, with interviews and research as a participant-observer.

From the primary and secondary historical research, I have identified possible factors that may have lead to the emergence of new forms of media. I was not attempting to identify all of the factors in these historical situations; rather, my aim was to complicate the understanding of new forms of media and their possible origins. In my initial research, technological forms, from papyrus to the printing press, have often been granted sole, or at least the highest degree of, agency in explaining media shifts over time. The methodological goal, then, of my thesis was to intentionally consider the category of technology in each of these cases. The theoretical work of my thesis, the initial identification of these possible categories and my suggestions of possible interpretations of these categories, would lend itself to continued research through additional methods such as empirical research into contemporary forms of media through ethnographies and case studies.

Subject Selection

Although the history of the emergences of new forms of media could arguably be traced back to the shift from an oral to a written culture in Plato's time, for this project I

chose to begin with a form of media that emerged at the end of the seventeenth century in Boston and was suppressed after one issue by the colonial government. Although the limited archive of this print artifact is available in Boston and London, for my primary source I relied on digital copies of the publication and Sidney Kobre's *The Development of the Colonial Newspaper*, which reprints most of the broadsheet and its content line-by-line. Kenneth Silverman's *Selected Letters of Cotton Mather* and Isaiah Thomas' *History of Printing in America* both enhanced the structural framework of this chapter by providing invaluable accounts of the influential people and technologies, respectively, of the time period and their relation to *Publick Occurrences*.

The colonial newspaper, *Publick Occurrences*, published in 1690, has the potential to problematize and contribute to past research. Its publication date allows us to reconsider the Habermasian model of the birth of the public sphere in the eighteenth century in England. *Publick Occurrences* challenges other models of the public sphere, reworkings of Habermas, which suggest specific roles for women in a primarily literary, but apolitical realm. This newspaper, the first for the American colonies, preceded the publication of the more often studied *Boston News-Letter* by fourteen years; questioning why it emerged at this time, and the reasons why its existence was so short lived may inform our understanding of government censorship and its potential to create the desire for a deregulated discursive realm.

To enter the debate of the birth of the public sphere is to gain greater interpretive power in the debate over the future of print, particularly newsprint. My choice to study the first colonial newspaper was influenced by my concern for the future of newspapers

today. While I have been working on this project, I have worked at a local newspaper that is part of a national media corporation. Although this company's stocks have fallen, even before the stock market bottomed out, to nearly a quarter of their levels only a couple of years prior, I believe that the atmosphere of mourning I have witnessed and others have described may be, in part, a self-fulfilling prophecy fueled by fear that any emergence of a new form of media will be totalizing. In other words, some newspaper executives, in my experience, believe it is only a matter of time before the print product becomes extinct.

I believe each of the subjects I have chosen to study has implications for our conceptions of participation, accessibility, and democracy. On one level, it was important for me to include at least one artifact of print culture to address claims that contemporary new forms of media are more accessible than older forms such as the book or newspapers. On another level, *Publick Occurrences* and Benjamin Harris' connection to the Boston coffee shops, may challenge us to consider how emergences of new media have always been both in some sense exclusive and inclusive—print's openness to those who were unable because of class or gender to enter some of the coffee houses may be tempered by its demand that its subjects possess a certain degree of literacy.

It is in part this question of models of democracy, particularly American democracy, that unites the chapters of my thesis. In one sense *Publick Occurrences* can be considered as the beginning not only of the American newspaper but of the American, however early, news media subject. The desires of this subject and his changing position in the historical scenes I have attempted to describe may indicate some possibilities and

limitations of each time period's degree of democratic freedom. It is my belief that each of these forms of media, beginning with *Publick Occurrences*, may have emerged at a time of crisis, or on the tipping point, perhaps immediately following it or when it is yet to come, significant shifts in the grid of our democratic society.

In part, these questions of participation and shifting ground that led me to consider, as my second subject choice, the emergence of the punk rock zine in New York City in 1975. In one sense, *Punk* seemed to be a necessary choice because zines may be seen as part of a subculture and many authors of these zines make reference to *Punk* as the origin of their branch of print culture. With regard to my suggestion that each of these forms of media may have emerged at a point of crisis, I believe that *Punk* may speak to the response of a mid-1970s media subject, the punk, and this subject's ties to a genre of music the origins of which many have described as nihilistic. We can recognize the shifting ground on which *Punk* emerged not only from these changes in the post-Vietnam War culture, but also from the design of the publication itself. I selected *Punk*, in part, because I am interested in questions of design and the degree to which we can relate design to questions of content and meaning. *Punk*'s design may offer an earlier example of the practices Bolter identifies in the design of *Wired*, which he suggests are an intermediary point between the print culture of the book and digital media and the beginning of the triumph of the subject's desire for hypermediacy. At the same time, *Punk*'s design may allow us to question Bolter's interpretation of these practices and offer alternative interpretations. Holmstrom's connections to Harvey Kurtzman of *Mad* magazine, the recent redesign of *Rolling Stone* at the time from a newspaper to a

magazine, and Holmstrom's apprenticeship under the influential cartoonist Will Eisner, who is credited as the father of the graphic novel, all suggest that *Punk*'s design may indicate corresponding shifts in the print media landscape of the time.

On a different scale than the newspaper, the history of the zine contributes to our understanding of a contemporary form of media that exists in the realm of newer digital forms of media. In a different sense, I believe the zine is worth studying for its contributions to our understanding of labor and collective authorship. With zines, even more so than with *Publick Occurrences*, there seems to be a gap in the scholarship, a general academic inattention to the history of this form of media. There are those such as Fredric Wertham, a New York psychiatrist, who in the 1940s became interested in fanzines from his research into the ways in which popular culture was harmful to the members of society and later went on to publish *The World of Fanzines* (Spencer 14). Since Wertham's work, however, there is a tendency to neglect the history of the zine as a form of media. For example, a timeline at the end of the textbook *A Social History of the Media: From Gutenberg to the Internet* chronicles the year Apple became a company, but nowhere references punk music, or any type of zine from science-fiction to the publications of 'riot grrrls' in the 90s to today's ezine.

Although the academic body of research on zines is relatively limited, the history of zines has been told before through other publications. I began to assemble a possible version of this history through first-hand accounts written long after the publication of *Punk* by zinesters such as *DIY: The Rise of Lo-Fi Culture* and *A Factsheet Five Zine Reader*. Of the works that informed this chapter, I consider the above sources to be most

similar to the “oral history” of the punk movement published by Legs McNeil in which he allows some of the people he considers to have been major players of the mid to late 1970s and early 1980s to recount the time period in their own words. On one level there seems to be much value in these types of sources in that what they may lack in peer-reviewed disciplinary credibility may be atoned for in their ability to offer colorful testimonials of, for at least a few individuals, the way it was.

With the first hand accounts of the history of zines and of the punk movement, these often-personal accounts overlapped somewhat in their timelines of events and significant individuals and actions, but they were not all consistent. For this chapter I relied on the accounts of two more in-depth and wide ranging histories of the punk rock movement, which both paid attention to the emergence of *Punk*, Griel Marcus’ *Lipstick Traces* and Jon Savage’s *England’s Dreaming*. In the case of Savage’s book, it may be somewhat surprising that he does not spend more time specifically devote to zines because, according to Spencer, he is writing as a former member of this community. He began his own zine, *London Outrage*, exactly a year after the first issue of *Punk* was published. Unlike Holmstrom, Savage used photocopying techniques (Spencer 192-3).

All of these and other secondary sources informed my historical approach to the punk rock movement and the birth of a specific form of print culture devoted to it. I was fortunate to also have access to digital copies of the first issues of *Punk* on the publication’s website. Although these files were not all-inclusive, there were pages omitted from some of the issues, they allowed me to attempt to describe the specific aesthetic differences of *Punk* and begin to theorize a dynamic of design between the

publication and other more mainstream publications of the time. Another primary source for my research was a collection of *Punk* excerpts published in 1996 *Punk: the Original*. This publication, although it lacked a formal introduction, conclusion or much analysis of the excerpts, did include brief descriptions of the pieces cataloged and a description of the zine's importance on the book's back cover. Both of these, published 20 years after the zine began, may show the degree to which the history of the punk movement and of the zine is still in flux. In one sense they represent an attempt by the zine's editor John Holmstrom to continue to ensure his place as an authoritative voice over the events of the 1970s. In another sense, the collection is part of a continual redefinition of the significance of certain events of the era. It is necessary to critically approach the inclusion and exclusion of material in this publication.

With these primary and secondary sources, there was information left outstanding that seemed critical to my research questions. I was not able to find in any of these publications or newspaper interviews during and after the emergence of *Punk* an account of the technology used to print the zine. Many of the sources credited the newly available photocopying technology of Xerox and other corporations as being a catalyst to the popularization of the punk rock zine as a form of media. However, none of these descriptions connected *Punk* with the technology directly.

Through *Punk*'s website I was able to make contact with Holmstrom and conduct a telephone interview with him. His account provided additional valuable primary information related to the birth of *Punk*. Although I believe it is important to be critical of his perception of the punk movement and the magazine's purpose and successes,

Holmstrom's first-hand account of the birth of *Punk* and the punk movement generally is critical to the success of this chapter.

The final subject I chose to include in this research is the massively multiplayer online game, specifically *World of Warcraft*. My research for this chapter and my entrance into virtual worlds began when I created an avatar in a different massively multiplayer online game, *Second Life*. Guiding "Mymeeisis Autopoiesis" through the digital interface of this massively multiplayer online world had a hypnotic effect on my untrained eyes. I was overwhelmed by the interface—the intensity of colors and the intricately coded "skins" that players could choose to purchase with Linden dollars for their characters' bodies.

After coming across an article published in the *Wall Street Journal*, I began to realize the necessity of questioning the terminology with which we describe massively multiplayer online worlds. Briefly, the article in the November 11, 2007 *Wall Street Journal*, "Is this man cheating on his wife?" told Ric Hoogestraat's story. He met his wife in an online chat room, three years prior. He joined *Second Life* about nine months before the article was published, as his avatar Dutch Hoorenbeek, his "six-foot-nine, muscular, motorcycle-riding cyber self" (Alter 2). Eventually, Hoogestraat was spending more than forty hours a week playing the game. On weekends he would sit in front of the computer for more than eight hours at a time, letting the food his wife brought him grow cold before he would notice it (Alter 6). At the time of the article, his wife, who we only know by the name of Mrs. Hoogestraat, is understandably, quite frustrated. The future of their "first life" relationship was uncertain.

I do not mean to use this one example to describe all, most or even some players experience using MMOGs. Rather, I believe, to widely varying degrees, there is at least one commonality between this story and other users' experience—the time spent playing is real time; the economic, physical, and social consequences of playing are, however big or small, real consequences; and the terms that are currently being used, terms such as “virtual,” “simulated,” “synthetic world” and “Second Life” ask us to believe that, with the emergence of massively multiplayer online games, we have the possibility of totally entering another, digital world, and the power of the world of “first life” has but only the power ceaselessly to print an obituary for the real.

In March of 2008, I joined the European server of *World of Warcraft* to continue my research into MMOGs. At the time, I did not know that I would end up choosing to use it, rather than *Second Life* for my thesis. However, after playing *World of Warcraft* for a couple of hours, I realized that its differences from *Second Life* were substantial. *Second Life* has a more openly commercial feel to it. The arenas of avatars walking and flying around seemed more like shopping malls than social centers. The goals in *Second Life* had seemed to be money and relationships. In *World of Warcraft* the goals were more clearly defined—to quest, to level up, to learn specific skills, to participate in groups, to help the team.

Just as every player is, I was confronted with the choice of which “side” on which I would play—Horde or Alliance, and which race and class I would choose. I chose to join the Alliance as a night elf in the priest class, believing, initially, that as a priest I would not participate in as much combat and that I would eventually gain the skills to

heal my fellow players. However, by the time I quit the game and chose not to renew my subscription, I had yet to heal my avatar or anyone else's, and I was simply using these powers to strengthen my character before killing saber tigers, large blue ostriches, hermit crabs twice the size of my elf, and other creatures, collecting their remains and taking them to a Blizzard programmed bot, who had sent me on the quest in order to, if I was lucky, receive enough points to level up. At a level 16 out of 70, it was taking me between 2 and 4 hours to level up. Of course, I am, in the world of massively multiplayer online games, a "newbie." There are players who work together to level up new characters. Individuals might have multiple level 70 characters and have gone through the process for each of these, becoming progressively more efficient at each pass.

I consider the time I spent playing *World of Warcraft* as research to the extent that it allowed me to gain a better understanding of the form of media about which I would eventually be writing. The chapter, although informed by my experiences within *World of Warcraft*, is based on the history of the game from the accounts of a number of individuals who helped to develop this new form of media, others' written accounts of playing the game, an interview with a student who has spent years playing the game, and the application of game studies, cultural studies, and theories of play, and simulation to determine what is at stake when we write about this new form of media and to form a systemic model for factors leading to the its emergence.

This chapter, because its subject is the most contemporary and because it is the place in which I make a direct attempt to address claims for the status of "new media," relies more heavily than the previous chapters on my own analysis of the form of media

and interpretation of its possible implications for its subjects. Writing a historical account of this form of media is problematic in that the form may still be considered as emergent. Instead of attempting to distance myself from the game in its current state as a static form of media, I chose to first focus on the developments that may have influenced the emergence of the massively multiplayer game and then offer some suggestions for the factors that may be influencing the ongoing changes within this form of media.

Limitations of the Study

With each of these chapters, the events the categories on which I chose to focus are not the only possibilities for interpreting the emergences of new forms of media. Working against theories that argue for the role of technology as a revolutionary agent of social change, I hoped to provide possible explanations of the ways in which media shifts can happen systemically with multiple agents enacting this change. With this goal in mind, I purposefully researched the role of technology in each of these cases. It may be that in doing so I have over emphasized the role of technology. It is important to reiterate that this study was never intended to generate concrete findings about the way things were; rather, I hope that this project creates new possibilities for research and generates more questions than it does answers. Finally, and with this suggested suspicion in mind, my own belief in the importance of print media for achieving democracy and my personal stake in the future of the newspaper as a form of media has certainly influenced this study in countless ways. I may be, at times, an apologist for the newspaper. This position may lead me to take an overly critical and possibly defensive approach to what is referred to

as “new media.” I believe, however, that a critical position toward these new forms of media is necessary, if not for what is to be lost on a limited and personal level, then certainly for what could be lost in the fight to breach the ever-growing digital divide.

CHAPTER 3

AN EMERGENCE OF COLONIAL NEW MEDIA

On September 25, 1690 in Boston, Benjamin Harris, with what some refer to as his “deplorable lack of judgment” (Tebbel 13) or perhaps what others refer to as his “fiery, courageous” (Kobre 1) nature, published the first American colonial newspaper, *Publick Occurrences, both Foreign and Domestick*. Four days later, Governor Simon Bradstreet issued an order suppressing this new form of colonial media. It was fourteen years before the next colonial newspaper, *The Boston News-letter*, appeared. Below its title, were the words “Published by Authority.” More than 100 years before the First Amendment went into effect, *Publick Occurrences*’ brief publication is a usefully clear example of concurrent government restrictions and emerging forms of media. The case of *Publick Occurrences* illustrates the perceived power of colonial print; the degree of fearful control exercised by the government over this new form of media; and a desire, strong enough in this case to risk imprisonment, on the part of a subject to acquire authorship.

Newspapers were not, of course, new in 1690, but rather the production of newspapers was new to this geographic area. To a limited extent, before *Publick Occurrences*, newspapers were available at the book shops and coffee houses, but these gazettes were produced on the other side of the Atlantic. In this sense, *Publick Occurrences* may be valuable for thinking about how we write media histories. What I believe we often neglect is a consideration of the impact of forms of media in places that, for geographic or political reasons, are removed from the immediacy of the cutting edge.

It may be an imaginative stretch, but there may be places today, across what we might label the “Global South” or the digital divide, where forms of media often perceived of as old might appear as new, and continue to evidence Jameson’s theory of non-synchronous modes of production.

Additionally, on a somewhat smaller scale, it is important for the study of media history to consider the continual emergence of an older form of media within newly formed groups. Although *Publick Occurrences* emerged to a newly forming society, we could also consider it an early example of a niche market. Niche markets today, whether they coalesce around enthusiasm for a leisure activity or a particular political affiliation, offer the potential for us to understand the emergence and life of any form of media as a series of reconfigurations and syntheses. In other words, niche markets today seem to offer by the way of sustainability what mass older forms of media markets have been accused of lacking. Or, the attractiveness of locally produced print in Boston could have had more to do with the specificity of audience rather than the form itself; the publication was produced for a specific group of people with specific concerns but through Harris’ choice to include foreign and domestic news, these subjects were able to engage in political discussions that transcended their limited group.

Despite the youth of the colonial newspaper, and, as I will examine later, the interest with which it was read by influential colonists, *Publick Occurrences* was so short lived that histories of colonial printing typically refer to *The Boston News-Letter*, 1704, as the first colonial newspaper (Kobre 17) and place less emphasis on this broadsheet that was published fourteen years earlier and was suppressed so quickly. It is possible that

these historians make a fetish of *The Boston News-Letter*'s archive as opposed to the archive for *Publick Occurrences*, which is decidedly contained within four pages.

To look at *Publick Occurrences* as an example of new media in the colonial Boston requires that we expand the critical examination beyond the physical archive to include the social setting and political stage in which this form of media appeared. I argue that what may seem to have been “an abortive attempt” (Kobre 13) at colonial newspaper publishing may point toward a larger discursive foundation that may look similar to Jurgen Habermas’ public sphere except that the discursive foundation that led to *Public Occurrences* would have, in part, constituted rather than being constituted by its print artifacts. In other words, Habermas indicates that the space for subjects’ critical perspectives was created, in part, first through the governments’ use of print. Eighteenth century print, he argues, created a space for these already reasoning and critical subjects. On the other hand, I believe it is possible that the critical position that newspaper readers came to occupy was already constituted earlier, in the case of *Publick Occurrences* at least in 1690. For now, though, it is important to return to the idea of a diachronic examination of the emergence of new forms of media and to outline the possibility that although forms of media change and emerge, the desire for expanded opportunities for critical discourse precedes and remains.

The News as Resistance to Government Censorship

The emergence of printed news in the late seventeenth century was concurrent with significant shifts in the political dynamic between the powers of the state and its

subjects. By the 1620s in Europe, citizens' natural subordination to the authority of an absolute monarch was weakening. In the 1660s, the use of newspapers as "the preferred instruments of governments" (Habermas 22) went hand in hand with the use of newspapers by citizens. These state practices created papers such as *Gazette of London* in 1665 (Habermas 22). According to Habermas' model, the transition from the government use of newspapers to newspapers as "genuinely critical organ(s)" did not happen in Europe until 1735 with *Gentleman's Magazine* (60). In this model early newspapers become connected to the government and ruling authority in as much as the government had the primary control of the newspaper and constituted its own audience of later-to-be critics.

In the 1690s the state was assumed to be the author of any newspaper (Tebbel 14). Harris published mixed reports on "Christainized Indians (who) have newly appointed a day of Thanksgiving to God" (Kobre 14), "barbarous Indians" who might have captured two young boys, and—one piece of news that might been a leading cause in the paper's suppression—the "miserable Savages" he claims were bribed into abandoning an attack on the French Canadians (15). He reported that more than 320 people had recently died from smallpox (15). Harris wrote that a fire in Boston almost destroyed the "fairest" South-Meeting-House, and about the suicide of an elderly, well-respected citizen. The only foreign news (to account for the "foreign and domestic" in his title) was his report on the revolt of the prince of France against his father who, Harris reported, has seduced the prince's wife (16). Tebbel argues that this last piece of news concerned the authorities in Boston who feared the reaction from eventual groups of readers abroad (Tebbel 15).

On one level, although Harris' publication angered the government, his publication may not seem to have been "genuinely critical" of the government. Perhaps then it would be more correct to accept that newspapers did not serve in a critical capacity until later in the eighteenth century. However, what should also be taken into account is the possibility that preceding the critical content of later publications was the resistance to government control, and therefore a critical relationship through practice if not through content, through production of this form. Seventeenth century newspaper production was a site of controlled desire. Citizens wanted to publish newspapers specifically because it was forbidden and therefore powerful. We should remember that seventeenth-century subjects had to control the means of production before they could put it to use for critical purposes. Whether or not we consider these acts of resistance the establishment of a what Habermas would label a "genuinely critical organ," they were dissident acts, necessary to the creation of a fourth estate.

Harris was already acquainted with the growing demand in London for a public voice, for a press that was not an organ of the government. He had been imprisoned in Kings Bench Prison in London in 1680 for publishing a pamphlet without royal authority. When Harris sailed for Boston, he was also fleeing warrants for his arrest for non-licensed publishing. Harris had also published a newspaper in London for a number of years until it was suppressed, titled *Domestic Intelligences: or News from City and Country* (Kobre 13). Harris's troubles in London shed new light on his choice to use a different binary—"Foreign and Domestic." We might wonder to what extent he felt that Boston was now "domestic" for him and news from London was "foreign." Publishing in

New England, where most of the residents saw their location as an extension of England rather than a separate entity (Lepore 17), Harris seemed to envision a separation between the possibilities of a public space in New England and the existing restraints in England proper.

It is possible to argue that Harris would not have envisioned this division and expressed a “domestic” identity had he not experienced government punishment for his previous publications. Michel Foucault argues in “What is an Author?” that books and texts began to have authors to the extent that these texts could be transgressive (285). Central to this argument is the idea of resistance and, perhaps, censorship as productive. Judith Butler works with this dynamic, saying—“censorship produces speech...censorship precedes the text...and is in some sense responsible for its production” (128). This dynamic between government and citizen control of the press gestures to the ways in which government control creates the demand for a free press and perhaps serves as an example of truly productive censorship.

If we consider *The Boston-Newsletter* and not *Publick Occurrences* as the starting point of the history of the colonial newspaper, then the government’s place in the equation changes. *The Boston-Newsletter* proclaims to us below the publication’s title that it was “published by authority.” The government, then, would seem to have created colonial newspapers for its own purposes. Authorship would not only originate but seem to remain within the structures of disciplining power rather than being created in those who are acting under, against, and in response to this power. In other words, Foucault’s model suggests that the desire to become an author may necessarily require the

possibility that publishing is a transgressive act. If we begin the history of colonial newsprint with *The Boston-Newsletter* and follow this history forward until restrictions lessened and citizens later published newspapers by their own authority, we miss recognizing a late seventeenth-century moment at which Foucault's model seems most applicable. If *Publick Occurrences* is the point at which we begin the history of the colonial newspaper, then we are able to understand authority and censorship as creating the ability for resistance and the demand for a public voice. Although Harris' publication did not proclaim that it was "published by authority," by publishing Harris did claim authority. The message was implied in this act. *Publick Occurrences*, as the starting point in the shift of the colonial newspaper production, tells us about what was not quite possible and about the desire for a new form of colonial print. This censorship was essential not only to the publication of *Publick Occurrences* but it should also be considered critical to the eventual loosening of the requirement to obtain a license to print and the emergence of a competitive newsprint market before the mid-eighteenth century.

Designing a Dissident Act

With regard to the three media emergences that I consider, design may be one of the most easily recognizable changes over time. As I discussed in chapter 2, Bolter has suggested that the design of publications such as *Wired* suggests a shift toward the later hypermediacy of digital forms of media. Although I will consider his claim in relation to Holmstrom's layout and artistic choices in creating *Punk*, it is important to question the implications of *Publick Occurrences*' visual cues. As I discussed above, *Publick*

Occurrences did not overtly proclaim to its audience that it was “published by authority” below its title. What the publication did include at the top of its first page was that its content was both “foreign and domestick.” It may be possible that this part of the newspaper’s name indicates the importance of a transatlantic dynamic that influenced Harris’ decision to publish in Boston, but it is significant that these words are much smaller than the other language that surrounds them. At the very top of the page, “Publick” appears to be printed in a type size roughly three times larger than “foreign and domestick.” A possible reading of this design choice is that the larger type size indicates a greater importance. At the end of the seventeenth century, words such as “public” and “publicity” began to be used in place of “world,” “mankind” and “general opinion” (Habermas 26). For the audiences of *Publick Occurrences*, then, they were a public that was created, in part, from a relationship between events foreign and events in the relatively young Massachusetts colony. The importance of “publick” for Boston at the time and the tensions between the somewhat exclusive public spaces of the coffee houses and the emergence of a new form of colonial print that would have been accessible to literate citizens should not be overlooked; however, when we group “publick” with “occurrences” to write the title as I have throughout this work—*Publick Occurrences*—we miss seeing that the largest word on the entire page is “occurrences.” The events, Harris’ desire to give a “faithful” account of current news, are given the greatest design priority. This choice may speak to the fact that the colonial newspaper, to a much greater extent than the other forms I discuss in this work, was about recording events and communicating occurrences that would concern the general community in Boston.

Colonial Newsprint's Beta Testers: An Unusually Literate Society

If the resistance to government control helped facilitate the desire for a new form of colonial media, then the cultural aspects of late seventeenth century New England provided some of the necessary tools for the emergence of the colonial newspaper. By the end of the seventeenth century New England had a population of about 100,000 and Boston of more than 7,000 (Kobre 10). By this time Boston had become a strong commercial center with an active harbor where merchants made connection with England, the Carolinas, Virginia, Pennsylvania and New York. This growing trade center was home to potential investors who might back printing shops (11).

The Puritans who came to New England in the 1620s and 1630s were concerned with literacy. Few other groups in England matched the Puritans' focus on print culture in the seventeenth century (Lepore 17)—for the time period, the Puritans in New England had established an “unusually literate society” filled with intellectuals who had attended Oxford or Cambridge (Lepore 39). Although the Massachusetts General Court and the Governor and Council of the Dominion of New England controlled the press for almost fifty years in Boston, their hold on publishing loosened a year before Harris' failed attempt at *Publick Occurrences* (Amory 83). *Publick Occurrences*, then, marks a point in the history of colonial print culture in which an atypically literate group was given greater access to print. With regards to print culture, then, the Puritans provided the necessary audience who was ready to accept a new form of colonial media in Boston.

For Harris to be successful as a colonial publisher he needed to establish ties within this Puritan community. He opened the London Coffee House in August 1690

(Tebbel 13) in the south corner of State and Washington streets and began selling books. Although he was surrounded by seven other booksellers who set up stands in the basement floor of the Exchange, a wooden building in the marketplace (Amory 97), Harris was set apart by his other occupations of writing and publishing (Amory 101). Harris quickly gained a reputation. In addition to books and coffee, Harris sold tea, chocolate (Kobre 13), and the current European gazettes at his shop (Amory 97). It is possible he helped to popularize this foreign form of print he would later try to produce.

Harris' choice to open a coffee house rather than a tavern might have been influenced by the Puritan presence in the colonies. These shops served as social centers, and before long Harris had gained a significant number of social contacts and felt he could publish another newspaper. Harris felt that his social contacts were essential to the success of his publication. Harris broadened the scope of his social contacts even further. Harris opened his doors to women who were generally not allowed into the other coffee shops (Kobre 13, Ford 28). In Britain the coffee houses, as opposed to the inns and taverns, were strictly segregated (Shields 20). As I discussed in my introduction, Harris' decision to allow women into his coffee house complicates Dillon's model of the division between a literary public sphere in which women were active and political public sphere from which they were absent. It is important, I believe, to restate that one coffee house does not an entire political public sphere make. The London Coffee House may be one case, among others, that suggests new forms of media emerge during periods of transition and change for given societies.

David Shields, in *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America*, argues that rather than “consent or dissent or custom,” “the richer more mutable category of manners” was essential to the development of a British colonial public world (xxi). In his “historical sociology of mannerly discourses” (xxi), the pre-revolutionary coffee houses created a space for discourse between gentlemen (and in the case of Harris’ shop, ladies) and merchants. The first colonial newspaper then appears to us as a product of the already existing discursive network—as David Shields says of the groups of coffee house patrons, “news became their common idiom” (xx). The coffee house patrons in England were “obsessed” with news (Shields 21). He also claims that the move from the oral culture of the coffee house toward the printed word “usurped some of the pleasure” from these patrons and offered a “middling readership” an opportunity to participate in “genteel” company (12). Colonial print first and perhaps most significantly transformed the social experience of those who had been excluded from the coffee houses. Indeed, Harris left the fourth and last page of the paper blank so “readers could add their own news in longhand before they forwarded it to friends who lived elsewhere” (Tebbel 13).

In the seventeenth century in Europe, mixed company conversational prowess was strongly tied to social status and power (Shields 16). The ability to hold polite conversation replaced in importance the societal emphasis on masculine valor (Shields 16). It seems these meeting places had become a place for subjects to begin their fight for authority. Ten years before *Publick Occurrences* was published, the coffee houses in London had become the meeting places for social dissidents. These “havens of sedition and heresy” were home to fiery characters like Harris who desired political change

(Shields 55). In 1675, Charles II had unsuccessfully tried to regulate the coffee houses in order to control the political power of these meeting places (Shields 55). Harris may have been nodding to the power of the London coffee houses he had left behind when he named his shop in Boston the London Coffee House.

The coffee house allowed Harris to establish close ties with powerful citizens of the colony who seem to express an interest *Publick Occurrences* after its publication. In a letter to John Cotton dated October, 17 1690 Cotton Mather said “the late sheet of *Public Occurrences* has been the occasion of much discourse, it seems, about the country; and some that might as well have been spared.” Mather expresses concern that some people accused him of being the author of the newspaper. However, Mather discusses his involvement using somewhat ambiguous language and some have argued that he did in fact have a hand in writing for the paper (Silverman 23). Mather, who would not frequent the inns in Boston, was a regular patron of the coffee house and Harris’ bookshop (Ford 27). Even after *Publick Occurrences* was suppressed, Harris continued to run the coffee house where he sold writings by Mather (Tebbel 14). Before *Publick Occurrences* when Harris ran one of the only two presses in Boston, they, along with the other press, had an informal agreement to allow Cotton and Increase Mather to have pre-publication review on any “books of controversy” (Amory 94).

The Techniques of Newsprint

A third and, in this consideration, final agent of change was the available technology of the late seventeenth century. While printing had been widely used for more

than 100 years in Europe when *Publick Occurrences* hit stands, there were few American colonial presses. In 1671 Governor Berkeley of Virginia declared: “I thank God we have no free schools or printing; and I hope that we shall not have them” (Kobre 6). Between 1639 and 1692 there were one or two presses in Boston (Amory 85). This limited scope of colonially produced print made it relatively easier for the state to control print. Additionally, the “geographically isolated New England theocracy” (Rice 23) had an advantage over London in regulating the circulation of unwanted materials. In England it was possible to evade government suppression by traveling to “the relatively free presses of Amsterdam” (Rice 23).

This colonial geographic isolation and limited scope of print stood in Harris’ way, but it is possible that the conditions in New England were riper for the type of democratic media participation Harris sought than the other regions. Michael Sproule says that the early American Republic, along with ancient Athens, would eventually become an archetype of the public sphere (259), and Boston has been described as the “cradle of [this] American Journalism” (Kobre 10). According to Isaiah Thomas’ account of printing in America, “Massachusetts claims precedence over all the other colonies” in regards to printing. Harris was fortunate to have access to what he felt was “the best furnished printing press, of those few we know of in America” (qtd. in Amory 92). Though Samual Sewall owned the press—he bought it in 1681—Sewall instructed others to run the press for him. Among these individuals was Richard Pierce who was appointed the government printer for the Dominion of New England in 1686 after the revocation of the charter and the following turmoil (Amory 92). In 1689, however, the Dominion fell

apart and a temporary Council of Safety took over the governing duties (Amory 93). Before the government was restored with a new charter in 1692, the Council appointed Samuel Green, Jr. the government printer. When Green died in July 1690, Harris, along with John Allen, took over the press (Amory 94). Two months later, with the help of Pierce, Harris published *Publick Occurrences* (Kobre 1). When the Cambridge press was destroyed in a fire in September, Harris and Allen's state of the art press was the only remaining in Boston (Amory 94).

It is tempting to think of technology, in this case Harris' access to this well-equipped, lone press in Boston, as an ultimately determining factor in cultural change, but it seems overly simplistic retroactively to attribute much or all of the credit for social and political change in the service of these technologies. Culture also creates its own rules for how a given technology such as the printing press is used at a specific point in history. The demand for the use of technology may be shaped by restrictions from those in power. In the case of *Publick Occurrences* the technology, the wooden press that Harris and Allen ran together in 1690 had an effect, but most likely did not directly cause the production of the first colonial newspaper.

It seems that the emergence of the first colonial newspaper was not based on one revolutionary agent of change but rather on systemic model based on the necessary co-influence of multiple agents acting together. By directing our attention to the suppression of *Publick Occurrences* and not the continued publication of *The Boston-Newsletter* as the starting point in the history of the colonial newspaper, we are able to see the ways in which government authority, Puritan literacy and the Boston coffee houses, and the

unusually-equipped colonial presses of Boston acted together to bring forth a new colonial form of print.

Publick Occurrences as the beginning of colonial newspaper history and as an emergence of a geographically new form of media, offers valuable insights to media histories that attempt to address the ways in which the birth of different forms of media has always depended on cultural, technological and political precedents and that media such as the newspaper, which some currently consider to be old or outdated, were at one time emergent forms.

Moving forward from colonial print I will return to the possible categories that I identified through this discussion of *Publick Occurrences*. The categories I have identified in this chapter are, of course, only a beginning to a more holistic picture of the emergence of different forms of media over time. This chapter and the following two are again only historical case studies and offer opportunities to identify variables for future inquiries into the political, cultural and technological forces that lead to the mediums we choose to employ. In the following chapters I also hope to question the ways in which history might repeat itself and to identify patterns over time, but I also hope to contextualize each of the forms within their own time periods to show that, for media history, it is false to consider a break between the old and the new, rather new forms are always in some ways connected to previous forms and new forms are always in some ways of their time and must exist in the moment to respond to necessity. Just as the coffee houses and book shops of Boston were not replaced by the emergence of the

colonial newspaper, I show, in the next two chapters, the coexistence of and relationship between differently aged forms in one time period.

CHAPTER 4

YOU DIRTY *PUNK*: THE EMERGENCE OF THE PUNK ROCK ZINE IN NEW YORK, 1975

In December of 1975, three young men posted handmade flyers around New York City. They said, “Watch out! Punk is coming!” Their signs at once spoke of the emergence of a new form of print media, a music genre and a cultural phenomenon. What John Holmstrom and Ged Dunn with the help of “resident punk” Eddie “Legs” McNeil produced that month was the first punk rock zine, a print artifact from which it would be possible to trace a history forward of the relationship between a genre of music and a form of underground self-publishing.

Its emergence complicates our understanding of the dynamic between shifts in culture and shifts in media. *Punk* demands that we reconsider the definition of an emergence of a form of new media generally because, at least for the time being, fresh newsprint on the racks each morning may speak to the powerful history of that older form, zines have remained, for the most part, hidden from the view of those who are not looking. As the publication’s editor, Holmstrom, said, even at the height of its popularity people had to know where to look to find copies of *Punk*. In other words, and to use a parallel suggested by Greil Marcus in *Lipstick Traces* between punk culture and the situationist movement, the mass advertising campaign that McNeil, Holmstrom and Dunn launched, may seem to have faded from view as quickly as it came. If there is a parallel between punk and the situationists, then we may be able to take Marcus’ connection a

step further. The walls of New York here, rather than the walls of Paris, “bled with unusual slogans” (Marcus 31), and rather than such words as “Down with a world where the guarantee that we won’t die of starvation has been purchased with the guarantee that we will die of boredom” the citizens of the city were simply told to prepare, to be ready, that something new was to come.

Connected to this underground status of most zines, this form of media has also existed mostly outside of systems of capital. If the punk rock zine was eventually instrumental in popularizing groups of musicians and allowing these groups to find a greater level of financial success through ticket sales and opportunities to enter into recording contracts (Chapman 230), these observations may be considered secondary to the question of publishing without the expectation of monetary reward. To publish *Punk*, Holmstrom borrowed money from friends, and when, in 1979 after the Sex Pistols made national headlines and may have caused punk rock to be associated with “everything sleazy,” (Holmstrom interview) the minimal advertising revenue that had supported the publication dried up, and Holmstrom was forced to quit publishing for a time (Holmstrom interview). Many zines today continue to be sold for a few dollars or less, and many of these creators base their charges on the hope of simply recouping their initial investments. Unlike *Publick Occurrences*, which was most likely not a direct source of income for Harris but may through the colonial newspapers that followed it and the continuation of the form, be connected to a contemporary corporate publishing industry, the emergence of the punk rock zine cannot be considered to have happened if we were to look simply at the economic success of the form itself.

Punk allows for a consideration of these dual questions of visibility and profitability. It demands a reconsideration of our understanding of what is meant by the term emergence and an interrogation of how aside from these questions we might consider the significance of a form of media.

Punk presents a case that overlaps in certain ways with the factors that may have led to the emergence of *Publick Occurrences*—*Punk* allows for a discussion of resistance to the impossibilities of publishing through the existing forms of media, an ongoing cultural conversation with London, the influence of the availability of a new technology of print, and the shifting ideologies of groups that are, by geography, class or taste, separate.

If *Publick Occurrences* allowed for a consideration of the emergence of an already existing form of media in a new location and by a new non-state author, we might similarly consider the emergence of *Punk* as the emergence of an already existing form of media, the self-published, handmade magazine, to a new audience for a new purpose. This repurposed form's appearance significantly changed. *Punk*, then, may leave us to consider the influence of design choices on the success of the new form and the preexisting factors that may have led its creators to make these aesthetic decisions.

Lastly and from the possibilities in the aesthetic of zines, *Punk* as mostly hand-produced self-published artifact raises questions about the place of labor and the process of production in the emergence of new forms of media. Although this discussion would perhaps resemble Bolter's description of our double desire for hypermediacy and its inverse, erasure of labor at the hands of transparent immediacy, zines may offer a

chronological mediating realm that counters Bolter's description of the fixity and transparent immediacy of print because it allows for the presence of labor and actively counters this process of erasure. Zines, then, would precede the explosion of hypermediacy he credits to later digital technologies. It is important to remember, however, that simply because Bolter argues for the possibility that we have always been confronted with the dual logics of hypermediacy and transparent immediacy, that labor is not present for readers in earlier forms of print. The labor of earlier print such as *Publick Occurrences* is visible to the trained eye. The materiality of print is evident, that it is a thing made. To understand the labor that produced the content, Harris' writing, requires a literate subject who is willing to perform a close reading. With digital media, as I will discuss in chapter 5, these possibilities may not be available to subjects, or, if they are, they require a much higher level of literacy and capital.

My description of these possibilities is only an initial attempt to establish the need for future research and to generate variables that could be seen, systemically and against the view of the invisible grasp of technology, to influence the emergence of a new form of media. My hope is to complicate the understanding of this once-new form of media and to contribute to the sparse, mostly unmapped, body of research on zines generally.

Punk told New York City to be on the look out for punk. When it came, the first issue featured a cartoon rendition by Holmstrom of Lou Reed on the cover. The corresponding interview, Holmstrom credits with opening doors for the publication. Holmstrom approached Reed at CBGB's in New York one night at a Ramones concert. Holmstrom, Dunn and McNeil had already begun planning the publication but had yet to

finalize their first interview. Holmstrom said he “hung out with (Lou Reed) all night” (Holmstrom interview) and according to McNeil’s account in *Please Kill Me Now*, Holmstrom went back to the ‘punk dump’ office and stayed up all night packaging the copy and transforming a standard interview into a hand-lettered back and forth that winds around the edges of a four-page spread with a cartoon strip recounting the interview on the center of the pages.

Inside the first issue, an article detailed the reasons why Marlon Brando should be considered the “original punk.” The author, Joe Koch, concluded that Brando “put himself in a movie (*Last Tango in Paris*) that showed what it all came out to. Nothing.” Between Holmstrom’s interview of Reed, this tribute to Brando, was the Do-It-Yourself Protest song in which readers were encouraged to reassemble a deconstructed sixties protest song, all among other things speak to the desire of the zine’s creators to begin to define what a punk was and where they chose to place the origin of punk music and culture. It was about articulating “this weird rock and roll that nobody but us seemed to like: the Velvets, the Stooges, the New York Dolls” (McNeil 203). Their project, in this sense, was less about providing a forum for the review of new music and more a cultural and political task of starting a movement.

As McNeil later said,

On TV, if you watched cop shows, *Kojak*, *Beretta*, when the cops finally catch the mass murderer, they’d say, ‘you dirty Punk.’ It was what your teachers would call you. It meant that you were the lowest. All of us drop-outs and fuck-ups got together and started a movement (Savage 131).

It is possible to argue that movement was both to open a space for an often-disparaged form of music played and enjoyed by “the lowest” and to aide an ideological thrust that not only influenced this music but also may have been the return of an older way of looking at the world.

A Question of Origins

From one perspective, the story of *Punk* literally began in the summer of 1975 in Cheshire, Connecticut. Previously, McNeil had worked in New York at “the hippie film commune” (McNeil 203), Total Impact, and Holmstrom had designed posters and programs for the N.F.E. theatre (Holmstrom interview). That summer both McNeil and Holmstrom returned to their hometown where they, along with Dunn, decided to try to produce something new together.

But when John and Ged and I regrouped, it was kind of undetermined just what we were going to do –films, comics, some sort of media thing.

Then one day we were riding in the car, and John said, “I think we should start a magazine (McNeil 203).

Self-publishing magazines could be traced back to pamphleteers, but the origin of zines as a form of self-publishing is often traced back to 1930s science fiction fanzines (Spencer 94). Some of these such as *The Time Traveler* were self-published using an early duplicating technology, the mimeograph machine, which was patented by Thomas Edison in 1880 (Friedman 10). These publications were distributed through the mail to a network of readers and other writers of the genre (Spencer 96), and fueled what some

have referred to as the “golden age” of science fiction (Friedman 10). For his part, Holmstrom also credits the 1960s, if not for the mainstream music and aesthetics of the decade, then at least for its example of self-publishing.

We had a lot of hate with the hippies. The flower-power types really hated punk, the real, today’s punk politics owes an awful lot to the hippies, we were not leftists at all but we were more right wing and conservative ... Punk has the example of the ’60s underground press, and there were a lot of hippies that enjoyed that punk was being a pain in the ass. (Holmstrom interview).

However, to consider *Punk* as a print artifact, we must also, however briefly, consider the possible ancestry of the punk rock movement. Although connected to this history of 1930s fanzines and 1960s self-publishing, the punk zine may be nearly impossible to separate from the genre of music and from the ideological resurgence which some argue fueled it.

With regard to its content, *Punk* may have been ahead of its time. Rather than reporting on an already established genre of music and cultural phenomenon, *Punk* played an integral role in constituting the movement. In fact, the zine was credited by several mainstream publications in the late 1970s with naming the punk movement. Whether or not the three young men with their flyers affected the degree of social change for which they hoped, they at least are credited with giving punk a name and an outlet. First published in January of 1976, it preceded the Sex Pistols’ first album by almost a year (Marcus 33). The Sex Pistols, a band that produced “the record that would change

the world” (Marcus 3), is seen by some as the quintessential punk rock group that made a breach in the pop milieu, in the screen of received cultural assumptions governing what one expected to hear and how one expected to respond ... [to] call the enterprise as a whole into question (Marcus 3).

But where did this genre originate, and how was it connected to the music that *Punk* had already defined as within the genre—“the Velvets, the Stooges, the New York Dolls” (McNeil 203)? For their part, The Sex Pistols, seem to have mostly originated from the mind of their manager Malcolm McLaren who operated a popular boutique called Sex on King’s Road in London (Marcus 27) and had previously managed The New York Dolls (McNeil 189). Before creating The Sex Pistols, McLaren knew how to package and profit from culture.

Nobody in New York was selling rock and roll culture in the form of dress and music, in one place. And the store, Sex, had a definite ideology, it wasn’t about selling anything it was about creating an attitude (McLaren qtd in McNeil 189).

McLaren was also interested in the political possibilities of music. He had been enamored by the May 1968 Situationist Internationale movement in Paris (Marcus 28), which according to Charles de Gaulle was a “revolt against modern society, against consumer society, against technological society” (qtd. in Marcus 32). He wanted the Dolls to be a statement against consumer society.

I just loved fucking with that kind of pop-trash culture of Warhol ... so pretentiously American, where everything had to be a product, everything

had to be disposable ... I'm gonna try and make the Dolls totally the opposite. I'm going to give them a serious political point of view (McNeil 190).

For punk rock the question of ancestry might seem to be “a question of nihilism” (Marcus 8). Mary Harron, who interviewed the Ramones for *Punk*'s first issue, seems to believe this sentiment was already present before The Sex Pistols album.

There was something about it that was very rigorous. It had an art element in it, always. There's a great interview with Richard Hell that Legs did in *Punk*. It captured the attitude: people needed to have something that was negative. I liked that time of decay. There was nihilism in the atmosphere, a longing to die. Part of the feeling of New York at that time was this longing for oblivion, that you were about to disintegrate, go the way of this bankrupt, crumbling city. Yet that was something almost mystically wonderful (Harron qtd in Savage 133).

McLaren's choice to push against popular culture and Harron's belief that “people needed to say something negative” could have been compatible desires that were both eventually articulated in *Punk*. However, to categorize McLaren's desire for political music with a general sentiment may raise the question of the degree to which, outside of his King's Road shop, punks' actions were informed by historical events.

One of the punk zines to emerge immediately after *Punk*, *Slash* from L.A. included in its May 1978 issue a dedication to the “handful of enragés who, ten years ago, tried to change life” and a picture of a young woman whose head was covered in surgical

gauze with a safety pin closing her lips (Marcus 31).

It is possible that when the Sex Pistols chose to use safety pins to close their shredded jeans, and this trend took hold and eventually was picked up by commercial clothing chains such as Macy's (Newsweek 1977) that the publications such as *Slash* that were in devoted to this movement then became attracted to the historical events of 1968. It is also possible, as Greil Marcus suggests in *Lipstick Traces*, to argue that McLaren's interest in the situationist internationale movement fueled the choice of the album cover for the Sex Pistols' "God Save the Queen," in which the queen's lips are safety pinned shut (34-5). Perhaps McLaren influenced the fashion choices of Rotten and Vicious, and the connections to historical events and past movement may have been lost on many of the participants and certainly the customers in department stores.

Or, as McNeil said, the movement, the definition of punk, was shifting by 1979 away from the way the creators of *Punk* had originally envisioned,

After four year of doing *Punk* magazine, and basically getting laughed at, suddenly everything was 'Punk!' ... because as the Sex Pistols made their way across America ... I imagine the rest of the county, were suddenly transforming themselves with safety pins, spiked haircuts, and ugliness. I was like, 'Hey, wait a minute! This isn't punk—a spiked haircut and a safety pin? What is this shit?' (McNeil 328)

McNeil argues, however, that what the people who blindly transformed themselves in the image created by McLaren did not know was that McLaren had hung out at CBGB's when he was managing the New York Dolls and watched Richard Hell

(McNeil 329). For McNeil, then, whatever trends eventually spread after McLaren had witnessed these artists and however the perception of punk had been changed by its packaging, it all began with the music of a few artists.

The first U.K. punk fanzine *Sniffin' Glue*, which emerged in dialogue with *Punk*, famously said, “Here are three chords, now form a band” (Marcus 199). This dynamic applied to the creation of punk magazines and intertwined itself with dada theories of art.

The formal dada theory that art could be made out of anything matched the formal punk theory that anyone could make art (Marcus 199).

For punk rock, the man who has been credited with creating the Sex Pistols, Malcolm McLaren, put it this way,

The Dolls really impressed upon me that there was something else. There was something wonderful. I thought how brilliant they were to be this bad (Marcus 49).

As Marcus suggests, maybe punk production was a reworking of dada production—“cut words out of a newspaper, shake in a bag, paste a random one on a page.” (199). Although Marcus is referring here to the production of the music, it is certainly fitting to apply this to the production of zines.

Perhaps question of ancestry in culture is “spurious” as Marcus says (21), and with *Punk* the situation may be complicated by a need to describe the emergence of a cultural phenomenon and not simply a form of media in a given location and time period. Although there are innumerable questions that remain, it may be enough to simply establish these connections that others have made to explain the emergence of punk

culture. If there is a reason to be found for the return of the desire for nothingness, then it cannot be credited to McLaren's shop London. Rather, there may be similarities in the conditions of life in Paris in 1968 and in London and New York in 1976, something that in January of that year was expressed by the creators of *Punk* and articulated almost a year later in the music of The Sex Pistols.

1970s Print Culture: *Punk*'s Resistance to Mainstream Music Press

If there was something captured by *Punk* and The Sex Pistols, it was something that was not entirely appealing to or acknowledged by many other publications at the time. It is possible to argue that *Punk* may have emerged as a response to the disdain of mainstream music publications such as *Rolling Stone*. According to Holmstrom, *Rolling Stone* "hated us" and printed an "a real hatchet job" review of *Punk* in 1976 (Holmstrom interview). Although by 1979 *Rolling Stone*'s Annie Leibovitz was following The Sex Pistols on tour (McNeil 332), the publication was not always kind to the genre. In a March 1977 review of all-girl punk group The Slits, the publication said,

(They) will have to bear the double curse of their sex and their style, which takes the concept of enlightened amateurism to an extreme... The Slits will respond to charges of incompetence by inviting members of their audience on stage to play while the four women take the floor to dance (Marcus 38).

The coverage that punk rock as a genre inspired in the major publications after the emergence of *Punk* may speak to the reasons the creators felt it necessary in the first

place to seek an alternative avenue for discourse. In a November 1977 review of Elvis Costello's "My Aim is True" and the Rolling Stone's "Love You Live" for *The Washington Post*, Tom Zito bemoans listeners' possible connection of Costello's music to British punk, which Zito describes as

the pseudo music of unemployment kids who disguise their
musical inabilities with garish leather outfits
and safety pins through their ears all in the name of
escaping poverty.

If the desire for negation or an underlying nihilism was one of the ancestors of the punk movement, then connected to those would be this resistance of the mainstream music press. Publishing *Punk* resists the authority of the music reviews in publications like *Rolling Stone* and *The Washington Post*.

Punk, in both America and Britain, offered young people a chance to establish some sense of control over their own lives, which given the political and social climate of the time was a challenge ... an attempt to break the stranglehold of contemporary society. Punk zines were often rants against this control (Spencer 188).

Punk, then, may have emerged both as a rant against this control and because it opened the possibility of seizing control.

New York City

The coverage *Punk* received in publications such as *The New York Times* was

made possible by the zine's location. As Holmstrom said, although "wherever we got displayed, it sold very quickly... if you wanted to find *Punk* you needed to know where to buy it and when it came out" (Holmstrom interview). For *Publick Occurrences*, Cotton Mather denied his involvement with newspaper and by denying it helped to establish its importance. Here reviewers for publications such as the *New York Times* denied the place of the genre of punk music and by doing so may have created the need for an alternate voice for publishing on this new genre of music.

Additionally, like the beta-tester Puritans of New England, the east coast youth were particularly well suited for the participation in a new community of print. The dynamic between the oral mode of the coffee houses in Boston and the possibilities for print that this discourse community created can be re-imagined as acting in New York through the oral performances of punk rockers and the possibilities those acts created for this new form of media.

Punk music in the U.S. was the product of an ongoing cultural conversation between the U.S. and England, a process that Savage describes as a "constant oscillation between London and New York" (139). We have already briefly touched on this dynamic with McLaren's disdain for the American consumer society he believed to be embodied in Warhol and Zito's review of Costello's album in which he feels it necessary to make the distinction that this is not British punk, as opposed to describing Costello's album as simply not punk. The conversation between London and the U.S., then, makes it necessary to point out at least that the role geography played was not limited to a certain location within the U.S. It depended on concurrent events that were geographically remote from

the place where *Punk* emerged and the possibility of continuing this conversation through print culture.

It is also possible to interpret the emergence of a successful punk zine as part of the ongoing generation, in New York City, of innovations in graphic design, referred to by some as The New York School. From this perspective, New York City was the cultural center of the mid-20th century as Paris had been in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Meggs 337). Holmstrom as a cartooning student studied, in his second year, under Will Eisner and Harvey Kurtzman at The School of Visual Arts in New York and credits them, along with his father who self-published a book of sketches from his time as a prisoner of war in World War II, as his main influences (Holmstrom interview).

Kurtzman had founded *Mad* magazine. When Holmstrom changed McNeil's first name from Eddie to Legs, he wanted McNeil to be a sort of "living cartoon character" like Alfred E. Neuman from *Mad* magazine (McNeil 204). Eisner, author of *The Spirit*, which recently has been adapted into a motion picture, and who some believe is "the seminal figure in a publishing phenomenon" (Thompson), is credited by some with creating the first graphic novel in 1978, *A Contract with God*.

Holmstrom also may have been influenced by the creations of artists like Paul Rand, in the 1940s and 1950s, that were marked by the use of "organic shape against geometric type" and "cut or torn edges against sharp forms" (Meggs 339) or Saul Bass, who moved to Los Angeles in 1950 from his home in New York, worked on the first across mediums film marketing campaign for *The Man with the Golden Arm* in 1955. Bass "reduced messages to simple pictographic images" and often used "chunky forms ... cut

from paper with scissors” (Meggs 343) and decorative hand-drawn letters with typography. In 1957, Ivan Chermayeff, from his New York design firm produced “typographic collages ... (in which) texture, color, and typeforms express the resonant dissonance of the music” (Meggs 345). In 1974, Mike Salisbury redesigned *Rolling Stone*, which had previously been a rock-and-roll newspaper, into a magazine that was marked by its “uninhibited, free wheeling design approach” and was credited with influencing the design of “many popular, specialized, and regionalized periodicals for a decade” (Meggs 351). Whether or not Holmstrom intended *Punk*’s design to be a synthesis of these graphic artists’ styles, that he lived in New York at a time during which it was considered to be a cultural center for design certainly did not hurt his chances of achieving a significant artistic contribution and, as he said, “to see something new in comics. It fitted the music” (Savage 132).

Busting the Vase and Pasting it Back Together Again

Although Holmstrom’s design choices can be tied into the work of these influential artists, it may be important to remember that their designs were the exception rather than the rule. For the most part, commercial printing at the time *Punk* emerged was aimed at erasure of the mode of production. Or, some designers have always created printed texts as if they were using today’s digital technology. Right angles, typed content, large photo spreads all enacted Bolter’s theory of erasure on the production process and present the finished product an audience who is then able to achieve a degree of transparent immediacy through the form.

If executed properly, the surface of the painting dissolved and presented to the viewer the scene beyond. To achieve transparency, however, linear perspective was regarded as necessary but not sufficient, for the artist must also work the surface to erase his brush strokes (Bolter 25).

Holmstrom confirms this desire to work against erasure and achieve what Bolter might label hypermediacy when he discusses the possibility of his zine creating something new. He has an eye toward history.

We weren't starting anything new, we were taking our favorite influences and playing with them (Holmstrom qtd in Savage 133).

Savage describes this tendency as a willingness to preserve the contradictions inherent in a movement that allowed the conscious remediation of the old and the new—“*Punk* featured Patti Smith on Rimbaud, Television on Gerard de Nerval and Richard Hell on Nietzsche (133).

In issue number one of *Punk*, the surrounding artwork is as important as Reed's insults: The Ramones play on the interview tape and one can see them in photograph form. When the interviewers follow Reed down the block, there they are in the cartoons. The effect was both immediate and distanced, a formal innovation on par with *Mad* magazine or the Ramones' own manipulations (132).

We must critique Bolter's description of the immediacy of print which he opposes to the hypermediacy of digital technologies—the issue, here, being the meaning of the text and the degree to which the meaning appears as either linear or multiple. But with regard

to the visual aesthetic of zines, Bolter does seem to acknowledge the possibility that print, through graphic design, can express hypermediacy. He credits *Wired* and *Mondo 2000*'s "patchwork layout" and "frenetic graphic design" with embodying the same logic as the cathode ray tube and the transistor (31). Certainly Holmstrom's design of *Punk* meets these criteria and, perhaps, makes the erased quality of other designs more visible.

With *Punk*, the visible labor within the finished product of the zine, from the handwritten text to the hand illustrated graphics, makes the human element, the hands of production, always present when we interact with the material product. This quality of zines may have the potential to challenge or problematize Foucault's description of the author function. The author's voice then speaks through the whole of the text. From the choice in layout to cover art to binding, the authority of a zine, in part, resides in a uniquely personal unification of content and form.

Perhaps it is something in the production of a zine, something about the pages bound together with string or painted staples, with pages of hand drawn art cut out and pasted alongside co-opted advertising slogans, something unconventional that better suits the zine to resistance. Although the poetic quality of any work, being a "thing made" (Teskey 47), is always in some sense obscured from our vision, in the case of zines, I believe the form somewhat lessens this process. I would like to follow Gordon Teskey's example from his description of Milton's poetry and describe this quality that zines more easily make apparent as "createdness" (47). According to Teskey, when we approach a work as interpreters "to retain the authority of a voice...[we] suppress something... fundamental" (47). The createdness of a work must be "deeply forgotten" (47) so that I

can replace the creator with the authority of my single voice. However, I believe we cannot approach a zine and deeply or completely suppress its createdness. The seams of the product are too apparent not to acknowledge the act of production.

Rather, with a *Punk*, I believe a type of oscillation occurs in which the reader, never able to completely replace the authority of the author in an interpretive position, joins with the author and, in a sense, shares the author's burden through a deepened understanding of the act of creation. The apparent createdness of zines, while it may not completely determine their use, in turn guides the community of reader/creators toward a heightened awareness of the createdness of their community. This awareness and acceptance of the ongoing and dynamic quality of organizing fosters a group affirmation of the multitude of voices always already at work defining the community. It works against a monolithic or static group sense of not only authority but also identity and history.

Xerox: When Technology becomes a Verb

For Holmstrom, this quality of zines that overtly speaks to the reader as a "thing made" is necessarily connected to the technology used to produce the publication.

It's so easy for people. Once the Macintosh computer came along, then all these boring magazines came along. (When I published *Punk*) I didn't know how to put out a magazine. Now everybody follows a box.

As long as everything goes digital, it creates a conformity. It is toxic to real culture. ... A whole way of looking at the world that is getting lost (Holmstrom interview).

Unlike many of the zines that followed it, *Punk* was produced using the same technology that larger publications of the time were using by a printer Holmstrom met one night at CBGB's. Through a loan from a friend he was able to cover printing costs of the first issue.

We used an offset process... Sometimes web, usually sheet-fed. At one point, the magazine was rolling off the same presses that ran off catalogs for the Metropolitan Art Museum. Never mimeoed or photocopied.

Never even published on newsprint (Holmstrom interview).

Punk, in some ways like *Public Occurrences*, used already existing technology to produce a new form. In the case of *Punk*, the new use of the technology, allowing the createdness of the zine to become apparent in the form, may have encouraged the production of zines after it. Just as there are some who credit the printing press with being a revolutionary agent of social change, there are those who believe the photocopying technology of the second half of the twentieth century led to the emergence of a high number of zines. As Spencer says, "You don't need access to a printing press or a computer to do-it-yourself" (205).

So, although *Punk*, as Holmstrom somewhat proudly proclaims, was never published using photocopying or mimeograph technology, histories of punk zines, which place *Punk* as the origin of this form, credit the new technology of Xerox and other

corporations and not offset printing, as essential to the continuation of this form of print culture.

Technology has certainly played an integral part in the rise of do-it-yourself literature. With each new development, there has been a change in independent printed output. The printing press, the photocopier and the internet have all played their part. Each has made the means of production more accessible and so the writer is able to reach further and more people are encouraged to take part. Some styles have changed, others have remained the same, but these printed efforts will remain as a form of cultural artifact, a record of the activities of underground culture (Spencer 93).

As Mike Gunderloy, the creator of a zine that reviewed other zines and provided networking opportunities for the zine community, *Factsheet Five*, said in his book *The Factsheet Five Zine Reader*, looking back on the number of zines that emerged in the years following *Punk*,

The 1980s were the time when the number of zines in print surged. This was in part due to easy access by many to photocopiers, a relatively new form of technology, but also because now there was a strong network [created by factsheet five<--mine] through which to sell your zine” (29).

Although some credit the dramatic increase in the number of zines that were produced in the second half of the 1970s with the increasing number of new bands, it is difficult to deny the influence of “technological improvements that made it much easier

and cheaper to print copies” (Spencer 188).

Among the newly available photocopiers, one brand stood out. After years of research and retooling, the Xerox photocopying machine was released for commercial use in 1959, and, about a decade later, many corporate offices were using the technology. These “sacred machines” were soon being used by “nascent fanzine publishers/office slaves” (Friedman 12). Xerox’s presence seems to have set a standard by which other companies measured their progress. In 1975, a year before *Punk*’s publication, companies such as Eastman Kodak Co., attempting to break into the “multi-billion dollar market,” were releasing copying machines that had been in development for roughly a decade (Business Week, 1975). By some accounts the copier industry was “growing at a phenomenal 15 percent a year” (Business Week, 1975). Even contemporary powerhouses of technology such as IBM saw Xerox as the standard against which they were challenged to compete (Business Week, 1976), and this expansive market was referred to as the “Xerox market” (Business Week, 1976). In the rapidly shifting terrain of the copier market, a year’s worth of innovation meant the difference between 4,200 copies per hour and 4,500 copies per hour as the standard for competitive machines (Business Week, 1976).

In 1970 Xerox founded a laboratory in Palo Alto California to research and develop new technologies. The company’s enormous success from photocopiers allowed them to pioneer new technologies such as the mouse (Briggs 226) and the graphical user interface (Friedberg 347). That the company chose not to exploit these new inventions and rather to allow other companies such as Apple and IBM to profit from them (Briggs

226) perhaps speaks to the perceived strength of the photocopying industry during the time. That this brand has now become a commonly used verb to signify the process of photocopying itself affirms the accuracy of Xerox's perceived strength and freedom to innovate without direct financial returns.

In the wide span of years between the Benjamin Harris' work on the Cambridge press in 1690 and 1975 in New York City, those with an eye toward publication ran the gamut from a handful of wooden presses to the mimeograph, which immediately preceded the Xerox machine's use for the publication of fanzines, to photocopying technology, which eventually helped fuel the emergence of the graphical user interface and desktop publishing as we now recognize it.

This technology in the mid 1970s not only allowed for easier reproduction of a form and for individuals who did not have access to the technology of a large press for reproduction to self-publish, it also created new possibilities for the form of the zine. Unlike contemporary self-publishing computer software, which allows the public access to the same tools as corporate publishing houses, the Xerox machine was significantly less sophisticated than the technology of corporately printed magazines. The zinesters who began using photocopying technology to reproduce this new form of media were, just as Harris had, using the technology for purposes other than its intended ones. Just as the press that had been brought to Cambridge in 1639 to print a colonial newspaper, the photocopying machines of the 1970s were intended for use by big businesses.

The resistance to sophisticated technology, part through the inaccessible nature of the most technologically advanced equipment, may have the possibility of saving the zine

from the predicted fate of print culture's artifacts. If the zine cannot make the switch from print to an online publication because the philosophy of the discourse community discourages that move, then zines will continue to be produced even as many other forms of print culture may make the transition to the internet. However, the zine has also always depended on the availability of the use of technology primarily in the service of other activities.

Punk helped define a new genre of music and an emergent subculture. The authority with which its creators are still able to speak about punk rock and punk culture attest to the degree to which their project succeeded. In 1996, the publication's resident punk, McNeil, published *Please Kill Me: The Uncensored Oral History of Punk* a title that pays tribute to Richard Hell whom McNeil had interviewed for the zine. McNeil pieces together the accounts of Iggy Pop, McLaren, Hell, Patti Smith and others to create a form not unlike the zine in that individual voices are not blanketed by a unifying authoritative claim for the way it was; rather, the book's form may indicate the ways in which the punk movement and the punk zine rely on an apparent multiplicity of voices and the making visible of shared work. The degree to which the book is difficult to penetrate without a certain level of knowledge about the punk movement indicates a level of success on the part of *Punk* and other zines in creating a specialized discourse community about this emergent genre of music. The case of *Punk* and the punk zines that followed it may seem to offer hope to those who fear the death of print. Holmstrom appears on the cover of the April 2009 issue of *Maximum Rock N Roll*. He is stretched out on a pile of zines. Below his photo are scrawled the words "Print media is dead."

Inside the zine responds with “Long live print media!” and a history of the genre.

CHAPTER 5

A QUEST INTO EMERGENT MASSIVELY MULTI-PLAYER ONLINE MEDIA

Certainly even in antiquity, the struggle against the body was not a new concept. If our struggle has always been against necessity, then the first, and perhaps the last, necessity that we will struggle against is the body. It follows that massively multi-player online role playing games would gain significant popularity in the twenty-first century, promising their subjects, among other things, a renewed way to address the struggle against this perceived physical entombment.

Emergent from Where

In 1978 at Essex University Richard Bartle and Roy Thrubshaw co-wrote the first online text-based multi-user dungeons, MUD, which is now also referred to by some as the first “virtual world” (Salen 754). This form of digital media, “which allow numerous people to log on simultaneously, write themselves new virtual characters and play out different scenarios together” (McClellan 1) remained popular through the 1990s (McClellan 1, Corneliussen 4), and led scholars to begin questioning the motivation behind the act of playing these games (Bartle 755). In 1983, Bartle, in what he argues was the first article published on MUDs, asks readers to imagine playing *Adventure*, an Atari Inc. game published in 1978 that introduced the concept of a “large, multi-screen game world” (Robinett 693), with multiple players.

You would not only be pitted against fiends provided by the game designer but could also be thwarted by another player, who might well appear out of the blue and mug you for all your treasure! (Bartle 1983).

Although these games may have offer users a sense of an underground, non-mainstream social space, similar perhaps to “temporary autonomous zones,” (Cusset 250) their popularity faded as the technology progressed, and corporations began to release graphical user interface foundations for this type of role playing.

We could, of course, also trace role playing back to the time of playwrights and the Greek stage, as Brenda Laurel in her 1993 article “Computers as Theaters” has shown. We could then follow that thread forward to pen and paper, tabletop, role playing games, some of which are still commonly played, such as Dungeons and Dragons, which came out in 1974 and Bartle credits with inspiring the concept of “levels” in MUDs (Bartle 1983). This thread would reveal shifts and emergences in forms of media, from the oral mode, to the reign of the pen and end with today’s keyboard and screen.

Eventually when the costs lessened and truly massive numbers began to venture online for role playing experiences competition leveled the digital playing field. In 1997, the first online massively multiplayer game *Ultima Online* was made by Origin Systems, Inc. (Corneliussen 4). In November of 2004 Blizzard Entertainment released *World of Warcraft*, and met with unprecedented success. Previously, the most popular massively multiplayer online game was *Everquest* released in 1999 (Castronova 819), which has received, thus far, more academic attention than *World of Warcraft* (Corneliussen 4).

The structure of *World of Warcraft* combines multiple game genres, which some have argued makes it “eclectic and opens up for a very diverse set of uses” (Mortensen qtd in Corneliussen 5). *World of Warcraft* had already been a popular real time computer game with several versions that were released in the mid-1990s. These games familiarized players with a progressing narrative that continues in the contemporary multi-player version (Mercer interview). When Blizzard released a multi-player version of *Warcraft*, the company included features that inspired a type of player versus player competition that transcended inter-character fighting.

In (World of) *Warcraft* you get your own character ... You have something to show for it, then you get different gear, then they added achievements and honors. It’s more personal ... in *World of Warcraft* you have something to show for it (Mercer interview).

Today, roughly 50 percent of the massively multi-player gamers are using World of Warcraft. In 2007, it was the most popular massively multiplayer online game, “with as many players as Sweden or Bolivia has inhabitants” (Corneliussen 1). In January of 2008, Blizzard announced that its number of subscriptions for *WoW* had reached ten million (mmogchart.com). Across the globe, computer screens emit a synchronous glow as subjects guide their characters—night elves, gnomes, and undead head into battle.

An Emergence of New Masses

As *Publick Occurrences* was not the first newspaper and *Punk* the first zine, *World of Warcraft* is not the first massively multi-player role playing game. However, the

geographic area to which it emerged spread across the first world and in an arena in which millions were already playing and interested in continuing to play, the stakes were higher for Blizzard Entertainment to be able to succeed and make an impact with their product.

World of Warcraft represents an emergent form of media when we look at the continuum of media emergences across time. Some have theorized that *World of Warcraft* represents a genre shift in MMOGs because it allows many different player types to participate (Corneliussen 5). The very first multi-player, graphic interface online game came out in the 1990s, but these games were not used en masse. In 2000 Bolter says, “But today’s technology still contains many ruptures: slow frame rates, jagged graphics, bright colors, bland lighting, and system crashes” (22). *World of Warcraft* allows for a comparison and a dialogue between older form of media and one form of media that is currently referred to as new media. Simply because it is currently emergent, and typically referred to as a form of new media, does not, of course, mean that it is the only form of new media that is emergent. However, the visual, and some would say “virtual” interface, the physical experience of the users and the questions it raises for what it means to be literate in the first world and how the spaces of our interaction are changing all make it a useful case. It is important to address the claim that “virtual reality (or digital technology in general) completes and overcomes the history of media (Bolter 24).

Resisting the Physical through the Imaginary

The objects of resistance of the previous two chapters, government censorship, cultural restrictions on social interactions in the coffee houses, unwillingness on the part

of mainstream magazines to represent a genre of music and the hippie culture of the 1960s, are, as expected, not the objects of resistance for a player within a virtual world. However, resistance is not absent from the story of the emergence of this form of new media.

A resistive interpretation of the emergence of this form of media yields a handful of outcomes—there is the possibility of perceived resistance to physical space, to the body and the perception of the physical self, there is the possibility of the creation of a discourse community that resembles colonial newsprint and the twentieth century music zine in that this community is united in their shared interests. However, this resistance appears to us much differently as well.

We are now forced to ask if a community that exists across borders can be a community—my belief is that it can be—and whether Benedict Anderson’s theory of “imagined communities,” which may have applied to print in the previous two chapters can be applied to a community that does not interact outside of the imaginative realm of the medium still constitutes a community per se. If we believe what Jameson says, “The internet as an immense collectivity—or merely a substitute for and a displacement of the Utopian” (Archaeology 164), then we should question whether or not this collectivity has the power and substance of to be referred to as a community.

As one student who has played *World of Warcraft* for the past four years, although he is now “on a break” from the game, said,

I went back to it because I started to miss it. After a little break, since it’s updated regularly, there are new things to do. I missed my friends on

there. I had played with a group pretty consistently for two and a half years, then they stopped playing. But time goes on and you meet new people as well. It's kind of what goes on in real life, you always meet new people (Mercer interview).

We also must question whether or not perceived resistance to the body is possible. Indeed, the resistance that we might identify in the creation of a shared community of players who interact with each other and spend time together, may prove more potent than this resistance to the body that we would attempt to identify. It is possible to say that there have always been theories of resistance to the body, of an eventual possibility of a disembodied consciousness and that these theories are even stronger today. We can see them in popular culture from *Being John Malkovich* to *The Matrix*, and I believe it would be possible to argue that, from the perspective of the act of watching rather than the thematic content of a film, every act of viewing, is to some extent, a resistance to the body. This would resemble Laura Mulvey's description in "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" of the tension between our desire to gaze at the human form and a "narcissistic scopophilia," which manifests itself through our desire to substitute our identity into the object of our gaze. In the latter case, we sit in a darkened room and attempt to forget our own bodies and enter the idealized body on the screen (201). Bolter describes the logic of transparent immediacy in *Remediation: Understanding New Media*, in which virtual worlds attempt to offer users "experience without mediation" (23). To achieve this immediacy, however, we are asked to suspend disbelief on many fronts. For instance, who would work on these machines of the future? Could the future of the human mind be

lost at the hands of a computer virus? And, for me, two of the most pressing questions that remain originate in the problems of labor and materiality.

To believe that massively multi-player games offer us the ability to resist the body, we must forget the labored bodies of the others that make this perceived state possible, or “programmers seek to remove the traces of their presence in order to give the program the greatest possible autonomy” (Bolter 27). The products, both the software of the interface and the machine which runs the software are constructed, on many levels, by workers. At a higher level, the software is written by others who are in control, who have structured our experiences. This structuring has the potential to problematize the idea of resistance. Resistance to the body depends on the acceptance of the restrictions of the body created by other individuals through their labor. This labor is not totally hidden from our view. With regard to *World of Warcraft* we are asked to download patches and we are given updates upon signing into the game, both of which signal to us that work has been done. Other labor is more hidden from our view. There is the construction of the machine itself, the creation of packaging, the shipment, the never-ending flow of bodies that has brought to us the possibility of perceived resistance to the body. The problem of others’ labor has, of course, always been with us. We have now, however, been asked to forget these laborers’ bodies altogether as we believe in the disembodied consciousness of our current experiences.

And even if we are able to forget the labor that has created the hardware and software that make this game play possible, we then must forget what we sacrifice by playing the game.

At parts where I got stuck, it would require me to put so many more hours than I was already putting in. A good raiding guild wanted me to be on 4 to 5 nights a week at 6 hours at a time, I just didn't have the time ... I've stopped again. Before that I was on less than before ... we raided 2-3 nights a week for 3 to 4 hours, not that much time raiding (Mercer interview)

At the same time that these laborers' work is hidden from our view and we are asked to forget the materiality of our own existence, *World of Warcraft* may call our attention to non-synchronous modes of production and metaphors of class. Within the game, the mode of production most closely resembles a feudal system, albeit one infused with magic, imagined creatures and transformed bodies. Some have argued there is a new economic system, a historically different brand of capitalism" that produces and employs massively multi-player games and other forms of digital media—"informational capitalism" (Castells 361). With *World of Warcraft*, then, we are aware of the technology and the network associated with late capitalism or informational capitalism while imagining through feudalistic metaphors. Jameson seems to suggest that this synthesis of older economic systems with more recent systems is characteristic of some utopian fiction. He describes an "industrial feudalism" present in the text *The Mote in God's Eye* that "synthesizes two antithetical modes and socio-economic arrangements, in which a decentralized clan system, with competing overlords, is combined with factories" (Archaeology 136). However, the so-called utopian move toward synthesis that we can identify in *World of Warcraft* is between the metaphor of an older economic form and the

possibility of interaction provided a more current one rather than the synthesis of two non-synchronous modes within the representation itself. Even so, it may be possible that the emergence of *World of Warcraft* has been facilitated by a desire on the part of users to see the labor of others represented and to resist the erasure of the interface. From this angle we could understand the class and race divisions within the game as working against the system which makes invisible the labor of others and the disempowered groups at the hands of our current economic system of industrial capitalism, or, as Castells says “the new system is characterized by a tendency to increased social inequality and polarization” (364). The creation of a digital divide, as I would prefer to refer to this tendency, is only furthered by the increasing tendency by those across the northern border of the global south to increasingly spend leisure time participating in massively multi-player games; however, the narrative structure of the game does allow for the possibility of these participants gaining a greater sense of class divisions.

Not only has the labor of producing the form become, for the most part, invisible, the workers have become constrained. There was, it seems, before the possibility of these workers’ resistance inherent in the two previous emergences discussed so far. Especially in the case of zines, the visible labor in the final form, in part, constituted the community. The aesthetic of zines works counter to the logic of transparent immediacy, in which “the artist must also work the surface to erase his brush strokes” (Bolter 25).

It also may be possible that this invisible labor that we are asked to forget does present itself as absent if we are digitally illiterate, in other words, if we do not understand what it means to write a computer interface. The hidden nature of this labor,

is what some have attributed, to our tendency to conceptualize the virtual. In other words, if we do not understand, because we lack the tools, then it may be easier to simply term the unknown, the virtual (Gitelman 19).

Forgetting our bodies, and the labored bodies that enable this act of forgetting, ignores the larger question of whether this temporary forgetting of our bodies constitutes actual resistance to our bodies. To believe that his or her character allows the user to have physical freedom of teleportation, running and jumping, a new shape or even a new gender, a new race or a class, is to forget that all the while, the player is sitting or standing at a machine, using his or her hands to manipulate this image, spending dollars or Euros or Yin that were accumulated outside of the game through some form of physical or intellectual activity, and this accumulation of capital happens within systems of inequality between classes, races, genders and nationalities no matter how level the digital playing field might appear.

In some senses the resistance that we identified earlier, could be thought of as the resistance to perceived impossibilities—the desire to transcend government restrictions, social and cultural barriers. In the case of massively multi-player online games, this particular point of resistance is also directed toward a perceived impossibility.

So it seems, due in part to the invisible nature of the labor and writing that constructs this form of new media, the perceived possibility of resisting the body, and the terminology that is used to describe this form of new media, *World of Warcraft* is often seen as another world. To bring ourselves to the imaginative frontier of these players, we should look only to the familiar, if not inaccurate (Cusset 259) riff on Jean Baudrillard's

work in *The Matrix*. Or, as Edward Castronova said, in his description of the economy of *Everquest*,

And it so happens that life in a VW is extremely attractive to many people. A competition has arisen between Earth and the virtual worlds, and for many, Earth is the lesser option (821).

Castronova believes that virtual worlds create characters as equals. If we apply his description of *Everquest* to *World of Warcraft*, we could say that whether we choose to be Horde or Alliance, a night elf or a troll, our “choices occur under a budget constraint that ensures equality of opportunity in the world” (821). So that, another possible reason that people would choose to play would be perceived possibility of escaping the hierarchical constraints of the world. He says that inequality within a game results not from a player’s choices in setting up his or her avatar but in the player’s subsequent actions within the virtual world. Castronova acknowledges, then, that to use this form of new media does not require that we truly believe we are escaping hierarchy, rather, we are asked to believe that we have destroyed the former system and are now active participants in creating our character’s level of mobility. We feel, in other words, more in control.

Castronova’s model may open itself to the same vein of critique we have been applying to the idea of a world that is removed from the actual, a virtual world. It is possible that the theories of the virtual created the imaginative possibility for the progression of technology, or at least that the technological shifts and imaginative shifts were each constituted by the other.

This possibility of the imagining of a virtual through the perception of the virtual through technology fits with the “empiricist maxim” “nothing in the mind that was not first in the senses” (Archaeology xiii).

From this perspective, we can look at Baudrillard’s 1989 *Simulations* as creating the space for imagining technological innovations that would mimic the disappearance of the real. In 1993, Brenda Laurel feels the need to define the “virtual” to her audience, who, we may assume has an interest in technology and the act of designing computer interfaces. In a footnote, she says

The adjective virtual describes things—worlds, phenomena, etc.—that look and feel like reality but that lack the traditional physical substance. A virtual object, for instance, may be one that has no real-world equivalent, but the persuasiveness of its representation allows us to respond to it as if it were real (8).

An Obituary for the Real

It seems important to ask Laurel, Baudrillard and others if the real has actually disappeared? Has Baudrillard’s prediction come true? Are we now in “the desert of the real itself” (2)? Or, has it only always seemed so because we have described it as such?

It is possible that the desire to separate the real world from the virtual is a Utopian desire. In *Archaeology of the Future* Frederic Jameson describes the Utopian as a space that “is an imaginary enclave within real social space” (15), and he identifies “cyberspace” as “an enclave of a new sort” that “once more does away with the “centered

subject” and proliferates in new, post-individualistic ways” (21). For Jameson, however, the imaginary is still always political, even if it is separated from what seems to be the real. So, to combine the dialectic between the imagination and technology and the desire for the Utopian, perhaps massively multi-player games such as *Second Life* and *World of Warcraft* allow us to witness transformations of our image prosthesis, in part, through our control, into something more Utopian. From these images, we are able to imagine the sensations that would accompany this new body. In other words, a new body, the body of an elf, may allow us to have senses and challenge the maxim “nothing in the mind that was not first in the senses,” the problem of “new sense organs and how we are to imagine them” (*Archaeology* 121).

In other words, perhaps the genre of science fiction not only allowed for, through its format, the emergence of the zine, but also allowed, through thematic content, the emergence of theory behind massively multi-player games. For one example, *The Mote in God’s Eye* by Larry Niven and Jerry Pournelle imagines “castes on the basis of variations in a body type rather different from that of earthly human beings” (*Archaeology* 133). Here we could think of the differences of races and classes in *World of Warcraft* and the impossibility, even with new sensory organs, of imagining a classless society.

Player in a Virtual World or Political Subject in a Material World

Looking at the emergence of *World of Warcraft*, some have argued the rise of online gaming stemmed naturally not from the resistance to the body but from the “primordial quality of play” Johan Huizinga described in 1938 in *Homo Ludens: A study*

of the play element in culture, around which ludology, “the field of game research” (Bjork 411), came to center.

For Huizinga, humans’ and other animals’ play is the same. From this premise, he argues that play is irrational. He says, “Since the reality of play extends beyond the sphere of human life it cannot have its foundations in any rational nexus, because this would limit it to mankind” (99). Huizinga it could be argued, as a renaissance and Middle Ages Scholar (Salen 96), was a student of a school of thought that draws divisions between human and non-human animals.

More connected to our discussion of MMOGs, however, is Huizinga’s description of the play of words. He says,

Behind every abstract expression there lie the boldest of metaphors, and every metaphor is a play upon words. Thus in giving expression to life man creates a second, poetic world alongside the world of nature (100).

Perhaps, then, we have found what makes Huizinga so appealing to game studies theorists. If we doubt whether Huizinga intended to describe a division, then we must remember that, for him, play is “a stepping out of ‘real’ life into a temporary sphere of activity with a disposition all of its own” (103). He claims that play has a beginning and an end (104) and that it is an “act apart” (105).

It seems important to note that those who study “games as games” are choosing to use a theory from 1938 instead of subsequent theories of play, from Jacques Derrida’s “Structure, Sign and Play” to dramatic critiques which analyze actor, act, and scene. Huizinga allows these theorists to continue the thread of play for play’s sake, that “play

provides no real-life material interest or profit for the player” (Cornelliussen 7). What we could consider as similar in Derrida’s “Structure, Sign and Play” with Huizanga’s description of play is the necessity of play. The former goes as far as to say that we have no choice but to play. However, for Huizanga, play is separate from our lives. Play exists in another realm. Play, for Derrida, is always inherently political. Play, for him, is not an activity we choose to do to entertain ourselves. It is a mandate on our lives. Or, this is the same complaint that Cusset had with theorists of the internet who were unwilling to politicize their writing.

The choice to use exclusively this theory of play by many may be explained by the debate between ludology and narratology. Ludology’s critique of narratology as a “research field that (has) studied games as designed artifacts—rather than as players playing games” argues “the focus on narrativity naturally tends to minimize the role of gameplay as a possibility for mediation” and may be the cause of “limited success of academic results adopted by the game industry” (Jenkins 422). In other words, there is a tendency in game studies to portray the acceptance of theories of play within narrative as minimal and not standard practice in the “narrative fields such as literature, theater and film” (422). Or, it seems that game studies conceives of narrative studies as focused more on telos and structure than on multiplicity and intertextuality.

Henry Jenkins in “Game Design as Narrative Architecture” makes this point and argues that ludology should acknowledge the existence of and theories on the pre-existing element of play within narrative. He uses examples from film to make this point, but we

could, given time, provide the ludologists with evidence of multiplicity from every text, printed or otherwise.

My purpose in contrasting these two theories of play is not to discount the work of ludology; rather, it is to show what is at stake for scholars in the humanities when we describe the emergence of massively multi-player games in terms of play—as with Baudrillard and theories of the simulated and the disappearance of the real, so too with theories of the separate nature of play and the linear, fixed and limited nature of narrative.

Jenkins rightfully intervenes in this argument, and we need only to consult 2003's *Democracy and New Media*, which he co-edited with David Thorburn, to understand what might be at stake in applying a critique that would affirm the multiplicity of a narrative critique rather than curtaining off game play into a separate sphere. He says, echoing Raymond Williams,

we must understand the emergence of new technologies, and in particular new communications systems, as a result of complex interactions among technological, social, cultural, political, legal, and economic forces (5)

Acknowledging the flexible, multiple nature of narrative allows us to apply narrative critiques such as Jameson's *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act* to massively multi-player games, and we can, as Jenkins suggests, get at the political forces that would, in part, lead to the emergence of these new forms of media.

I would like to suggest a possible political critique of *World of Warcraft* that deserves future attention—the emergence of the game in response to the subconscious anxiety of subjects in a world that was, for more than a year when the game emerged and

still is today, at war. This interpretation at once could account for a collective desire to escape the world outside of the game, the need to play to act out feelings of frustration and helplessness, the return of feudalism and sharp divisions between class and race, the opposition of an alliance and the masses of a tribal horde, and the point to which science and the enlightenment have brought us in their quest to suppress myth and myth's new found insurgence.

With the political interpretation of game play, we remember the importance of history and, in our description of the emergence of this new form of media, offer resistance to the ahistoric tendency to claim that this time is separate. We can remember, as Benjamin suggested, the angel of history that has its face turned towards the past, even as his wings are blown the emergent edge of the future.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

On one level, the preceding chapters are my initial historical interventions into an often one-sided debate over the status of print. To return to Debord's quote, with which I began this work, I believe some of the difficulty of challenging current perceptions of older forms of media lies in digital media's ability to mesmerize the subject, and as I discussed in the previous chapter, digital media's suppression of the processes of production, through software, only complicates this task. To make an intervention now requires us to demonstrate the powerful potential of print and to consider its qualities against these newer forms. We must consider to what extent subjects gained new possibilities through the emergence of each form and whether these possibilities were realized or simply empty promises. One goal of the case studies of the previous chapters was to attempt this work.

If the emergence of a new form of media is the point at which a social actor uses the tools available to him to resist perceived impossibilities, then this resistance, it seems, may manifest itself in the creation of different spaces for social interaction and shifts in the definition of what it means to be a member of a public. In each of these cases, it may be that the new form of media did not solely create a new social space, but rather may have facilitated the creation of this space and articulated its presence. Furthermore, to say that each of these forms of media may have either created or at least provided evidence of a new public requires that we consider the changing definition of the private. With the case of *Publick Occurrences*, Harris' resistance to the colonial government created an

alternative social space to the physically more exclusive social spaces of the coffee houses in Boston. As I suggested in chapter 3, it may be possible to argue that Harris was also influential in changing these exclusive social spaces by allowing women into his coffee house. The extent to which this fact challenges models such as Dillon's of the dynamic between public and private spaces during the time period may be one factor among many that suggests the periods during which new forms of media emerge are already periods of transition and transformation.

Although the coffee houses themselves may have been undergoing changes, the space created by *Publick Occurrences* was a departure from the at least somewhat closed doors and limited opportunities for discourse of older social spaces. In this sense, the colonial newspaper was more accessible to subjects. With each of these case studies, however, it is important to remember that each possible change in social spaces and each shift in the definition of what it means to be a member of a public correspond to changes in the requirements of subjects. With colonial print, subjects' freedom to participate was accompanied by a new demand that they possess literacy. The unusually high level of literacy in New England in the late seventeenth century may suggest that to some extent a certain percentage of a given population must already possess certain the qualifications newly demanded by the emergent form of media. The public that each form of media constitutes is necessarily different, and with *Publick Occurrences* the newly created public seems to rely on a somewhat sharp division between the private business of individuals in their domestic lives and the burgeoning creation of a sense of public. We may question to what extent this newly forming publicly domestic identity was also

constituted by the transatlantic discourse through print. In other words, Harris articulated the shared domestic space of Boston through his choice to name the publication *Publick Occurrences: Both foreign and domestic*. If a new form of media does create then a new social space, this creation is dependent on some already existing possibilities inherent in a given geography.

Two hundred and eighty-five years later the space created by the punk rock zine must necessarily appear significantly changed. As Holmstrom said, *Punk* was not widely distributed. It was produced for a niche market of like-minded individuals. Rather than the creation of a new social space that was, by default, more accessible to subjects than the physical social spaces which preceded it, literate readers of the time who were in New York City and knew where to buy the publication, would seemingly have had no more difficulty reading *Punk* than the mainstream music magazines of the time. If *Punk* helped to create a new public, and this may be a safe bet if we consider the degree to which the zine was credited with fueling the cultural phenomenon that shared its name, then the social space it created was, by design, countercultural if not subcultural. *Publick Occurrences*, then, invited its subjects to participate in shared space that was wide enough to include news of the deaths of roughly 300 from smallpox, a fire at the South-Meeting House and the romantic escapades of the French royalty. *Punk*, on the other hand, created a space for discourse about an emergent genre of music. The difference here may be, at a most literal level, the difference between what populations are intended by the terms ‘occurrences’ and ‘punk.’ In 1690, the public appears as a grouping together in a new space of citizens, and in 1975 this public may seem to return closer to the

private spaces of production. It is important to remember the diachronic nature of these formations and consider the possibility that *Punk*'s contribution may be the creation of a smaller public within the already existing public that was constituted, with respect to America, roughly three hundred years earlier and has undergone continual revisions ever since.

Although it may seem that *Punk* did not require its readers to possess a greater level of literacy than was required of readers of the more mainstream music magazines, in actuality it may be that readers of the zine were required to have a more in-depth and quite specific cultural literacy in order to participate in this new social space. As I suggested in chapter 4, we might consider CBGB's and other physical social spaces where artist such as The Ramones, Lou Reed and Richard Hell played in New York City in 1975 to have been the coffee houses of the day. The patrons of these venues were part of an emergent public. In one sense, the publics created by *Publick Occurrences* and *Punk* were defined by their objects of resistance. If Harris was resisting government restrictions on publishing, then the product he created would seem to be a product for all those subjects under the authority of the government. If *Punk* was pushing against mainstream culture, specifically the culture of the hippie movement and the tendency in of publications to demonize a new genre of music, then perhaps the space created through the zine was for the already existing and possibly dissatisfied audience of these magazines and those who had experienced and arguably moved beyond the hippie culture of the 1960s. In the case of *Punk* it also may be the case that this space was created for those subjects who not only met these requirements but who also already had an

inclination to question these aspects of the time period. Finally, as I mention in chapter 4 and to consider another parallel between the two forms of print media in my work, the transatlantic dynamic between London and the U.S. shaped the emergence of a new public in the end of the twentieth century in New York City.

As I briefly discussed in chapter 5, *World of Warcraft* may challenge us to consider whether a community that exists across spaces and may not interact outside of the imaginative realm of the medium still constitutes a community. With regard to the possibility of the creation of a new public, this appears to us much changed, or, in other words, it does not appear to us. With the previous two examples it is possible to argue that already existing physical spaces, the coffee houses of Boston and the venues of New York City allowed for the creation and continual recreation of the publics created by the forms of print media. If a significant question for media change is the question of spaces, we can take this a step further and question whether or not the difference between these two forms of print media and this form of digital media is that the subjects of print media conceive of their interaction with the form of media as an extension of the physical realm outside of the form and that subjects of this form of digital media are asked to and do believe that their interaction with the form exists in an entirely separate realm. Whether we can identify unconscious political desires such as subjects' need to act out feelings of frustration and helplessness at living in a world at war, what content we can identify within the game does not seem to exist in a reflexive relationship to occurrences outside of the game. When we consider the changes in forms of media over time, this lack of an identifiable content, even allowing that subjects may form social connections within the

game and use the game's whisper function to communicate about their personal lives, the case of *World of Warcraft* suggests that not only has the definition of public been continually revised, the definition of content has shifted from events with a general appeal to the more specific interests of a subculture to the shared activities within the telos of the game. In other words, the content of this new form of media may be each participant's experience in completing the predetermined tasks at hand.

As with *Publick Occurrences* and *Punk*, this form of media demands that subjects meet certain requirements. Rather than a level of literacy and the knowledge of a specific genre of music, *World of Warcraft* asks that subjects not only have certain motor skills and learn how to navigate the truly massive interface of the game's software but, most importantly, that subjects have a high level of computer literacy before they are able to participate in this community. To achieve this level of literacy requires that subjects have and have had access to much more expensive computer equipment. The game does not simply require that subjects have access to a computer. The game requires a high level of processing power. Unlike some forms of digital media, to participate in *World of Warcraft*, users must purchase a subscription, which can add up to hundreds of dollars spent on the game in a year. Patches, downloads with extra game features, are required on a continual basis, and to download these patches and to play the game in general, users must also have access to a high speed internet connection. These and other weighty requirements suggest that the space created by *World of Warcraft* limits subjects just as much if not greater than it allows them a new freedom outside of the perceived fixed and linear realm of print.

Or, to return to a discussion of discipline from chapter 3, the colonial newspaper required subjects to be literate. The discipline of the form positioned those subjects as readers. Although each reader may not have had the opportunity to reproduce through access to the technology of printing, they had the power to reproduce the stylistic and literary conventions. This model applies to the punk rock zine as well. Readers, although required to possess knowledge of a specific discourse community, were able to and did reproduce the form. With *World of Warcraft*, however, subjects are disciplined to become better players within the game. Users are not disciplined to reproduce the form, and in fact they are prevented from this possibility. The software, as Friedrich Kittler argues, “has gained in user-friendliness as it more closely approximates the ideal of the one-way function” (158). The software of digital media then does create new subjects. As he says,

the subjects of the Microsoft Corporation did not simply fall from the sky, but first had to be produced like all of their media-historical predecessors—the readers of books, film audiences and TV viewers. The only problem not is how their subjugation can be hidden from the subjects in order that they fall in step with the global triumphal march (158).

I read this “global triumphant march” as the usurping of the possibility of the earlier type of empowering discipline found in print media from subjects and the victories of those who create digital forms of media such as Blizzard Entertainment by producing subjects, or more accurately by producing paying consumers.

The historical aims of my research cannot be separated from a concern, in each case, with technology. I believe that today’s ahistorical tendency to describe ‘new media’

as if it will always be new and to believe that it has now taken the place of older forms of media relies, in part, on a misunderstanding of technology's relationship to society. This was a methodological goal of my research – to intentionally include technology as one factor that influenced each of these emergences but not to cede to this technology a level of agency greater than other possible factors. From the colonial press, to the offset printing techniques of the 1970s, to contemporary computer hardware and software, technology appears as one agent among many that allows for these new forms. In each of these cases existing technologies were used in new ways. In other words, human desire, which again may have been created by perceived impossibilities, was necessary to the creation of something new. For example, with *Publick Occurrences*, Pierce had not been using the press in Boston to produce newspapers; rather, for colonial newsprint to emerge, Harris had to travel from London and convince Pierce to use the well-equipped press in an unconventional way. In the case of *Punk* this dynamic is complicated somewhat. Holmstrom used a relatively expensive and thereby limited existing technique, off-set printing, to produce *Punk*, but his unconventional design choices may have encouraged the punk zinesters after him to repurpose the less expensive and increasingly available photocopying technology. With *World of Warcraft* it may be that the logical development of the graphical user interface was not into a virtual world but that the desire of a number of subjects who had already been participating in the multi-user dungeons, in part, fueled this development.

My work has also been an attempt to engage in ongoing debate about media change that, in once sense, includes the work of theorists such as Eisenstein who, as I

discussed in my introduction and chapter 3, believe that technology can and has been a revolutionary as opposed to evolutionary agent of social change. On the other hand, I have entered the discussion about new media's relationship to older forms and therefore felt it necessary to unpack the implications for my research of Bolter's theories of new media. In one sense, I am inclined to agree with him that it is important to discuss changes in design between the book and the hyperlink. For Bolter these changes in design begin with magazines such as *Wired*, and even though he seems to allow for these publications to possess a degree of hypermediacy, he seems to only credit this quality to the design as opposed to the content of the publications. Although I believe it is important to consider these types of design shifts, I believe they began earlier than Bolter suggests and that these changes, in the case of zines, may have had more to do with a do-it-yourself ethos and not a shifting away from linearity and toward fluidity and multiplicity. For me, then, zines are not a point on a continuum from hierarchy to chaos. Rather, if we consider the design of zines and the emergence of digital media in terms of labor and subjects' status, then the zine appears as a moment at which labor was highly visible and subjects were empowered to reproduce a form. I agree with Kittler that digital forms of media, for any flexibility and openness Bolter and others may attribute to them, seem to have the greatest tendency to hide labor and to prevent subjects' agency.

It is this quality of digital media that necessitates more scholarship that considers digital forms of media alongside older forms of media. Works such as Lisa Gitelman's *Always Already New*, in which she discusses the phonograph alongside the Web, have already taken up this task, but there is more work to be done. Alongside models of

remediation that interpolate older forms of media as being remixed within newer forms, I believe it is important to return to histories of emergences of forms of media and to recognize the antagonism between nonsynchronous forms of media that have survived to the present day to show that, despite new media's claim that it has taken the place of old media, the debate continues.

WORKS CITED

- Alter, Alexander. "Is this man cheating on his wife?" *The Wall Street Journal*. August 10 2007. Nov. 27, 2007. <http://online.ws.j.com/public/article_print/SB118670164592393622.html>
- Amory, Hugh. "New England 1638-1713." *A History of the Book in America: The Colonial Book in the Atlantic World*. Ed. Hugh Amory and David Hall. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1983.
- Bartle, Richard. "Hearts, Clubs, Diamonds, Spades: Players Who Suit MUDs." *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 754-787.
- . "Voice from the Dungeon." 1983. <<http://www.mud.co.uk/richard/avftd.htm>>
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulations*. Trans. Paul Foss, Paul Patton and Philip Beitchman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1983.
- Bjork, Staffan, and Jussi Holopainen. "Games and Design Patterns." *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 410-437.
- Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MIT Press, 2000.
- Briggs, Asa and Peter Burke. *A Social History of the Media: From Gutenberg to the Internet*. Malden: Polity, 2005.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Castells, Manuel. *End of Millenium*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 1998.
- Castronova, Edward. "Virtual Worlds: A First-Hand Account of Market and Society on the Cyberian Frontier." *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 814-863
- Chapman, Jane. *Comparative Media History*. Malden: Polity, 2005.
- Chartier, Roger. *The Order of Books*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.

- Chun, Wendy Hui. *New Media, Older Media: A History and Theory Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Corneliussen, Hilde and Jill Walker Rettberg. *Digital Culture, Play, and Identity: A World of Warcraft Reader*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008.
- Cusset, Francois. *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*. Trans. Jeff Fort. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008.
- Debord, Guy. *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. New York: Verso, 1998.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences." *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. London: Routledge, 278-294.
- Dillon, Elizabeth. *The Gender of Freedom: Fictions of Liberalism and the Literary Public Sphere*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2004.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. "Defining the Initial Shift: Some Features of Print Culture." *The Book History Reader*. Ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Ellis, Charles. *Joe Wilson and the Creation of Xerox*. Hoboken: Wiley, 2006.
- Foucault, Michel. "The Order of Discourse." Rptd. *In Modern Literary Theory*. Ed. Philip Rice and Patricia Waugh.
- . "What is an Author?" *The Book History Reader*. Ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Ford, Worthington Chauncey. *The Boston Book Markey 1679-1700*. Boston: The Club of Odd Volumes, 1917.
- Friedberg, Anne. "The Virtual Window." *Rethinking Media Change*. Ed. David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003.
- Friedman, R. Seth. *The Factsheet Five Reader: The Best Writing from the Underground World of Zines*. New York: Three Rivers, 1997.
- Gitelman, Lisa and Geoffrey B. Pingree. *New Media, 1740-1915*. Cambridge: MIT P, 2003.
- Gitelman, Lisa. *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006.

- Habermas, Jürgen. *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT P, 1991.
- Holmstrom, John. Telephone interview. 12 February 2009.
- “How to nip away at the Xerox market.” *Business Week*. 8 November 1976. P. 68
- Huizinga, Johan. “Nature and Significance of Play as a Cultural Phenomenon.” *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 96-121.
- “IBM’s new copier.” *Business Week*. 22 March 1976. P. 52.
- Jameson, Frederic. *Archaeologies of the Future: The Desire Called Utopia and Other Science Fictions*. New York: Verso, 2005.
- . *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1981.
- Jenkins, Henry. “Game Design as Narrative Architecture.” *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 670-689.
- Jenkins, Henry and David Thorburn. *Democracy and New Media*. Cambridge, MIT Press, 2003.
- Johns, Adrian. “The Book of Nature and the Nature of the Book.” *The Book History Reader*. Ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Kahn, Victoria. *Wayward Contracts: The Crisis of Political Obligation in England 1640-1674*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2004.
- Kittler, Friedrich. *Literature, Media, Information Systems*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Kobre, Sidney. *The Development of the Colonial Newspaper*. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1960.
- “Kodak’s copier.” *Business Week*. 12 May 1975. P. 34
- Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Laurel, Brenda. *Computers as Theater*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Professional, 1993.

- Lepore, Jill. "Literacy and Reading in Puritan New England." *Perspectives on American Book History*. Ed. Scott Casper, Joanne Chaison, and Jeffrey Groves. Boston: U of Mass P, 2002.
- Marcus, Greil. *Lipstick Traces: A Secret History of the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2003.
- McClellan, Jim. "Cyberspace: Guys and Trolls." *The Observer*. 22 January 1995.
<<http://www.lexisnexis.com>>
- McNeil Legs and McCain Gillian, *Please Kill Me Now: the uncensored oral history of punk*. New York: Grove Press, 1996.
- Meggs, Philip B. *A History of Graphic Design*. New York: Wiley, 1998.
- Mercer, David. Telephone interview. 24 February 2009.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." *Narrative, Apparatus, Ideology*. Ed. Philip Rosen. New York: Columbia UP, 198-209.
- Noll, Michael A. *The Evolution of Media*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2007.
- Rice, Grantland S. *Transformation of Authorship in America*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997.
- Robinett, Warren. "Adventure as a Video Game: Adventure for the Atari 2600." *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Ed. Katie Salen and Eric Zimmerman. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 670-689.
- Salen, Katie and Eric Zimmerman. *The Game Design Reader: A Rules of Play Anthology*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 670-689.
- Savage, Jon. *England's Dreaming: Anarchy, Sex Pistols, Punk Rock and Beyond*. New York: Faber and Faber, 2001.
- Shields, David. *Civil Tongues and Polite Letters in British America*. Chapel Hill: U of NC P, 1997.
- Silverman, Kenneth. *Selected Letter of Cotton Mather*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1971.
- Spencer, Amy. *DIY: The rise of lo-fi Culture*. London: Marion Boyars, 2005.

- Sproule, Michael J. "Organization Rhetoric and the Public Sphere." *Communication Studies*. Winter 1989, 40/4. 258-265.
- Tebbel, John. *The Compact History of the American Newspaper*. New York: Hawthorn, 1969.
- Teskey, Gordon. *Delirious Milton: The Fate of the Poet in Modernity*. Harvard UP, Cambridge: 2006.
- Thomas, Isaiah. *History of Printing in America*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1874.
- Warner, Michael. *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Cambridge: Harvard: UP, 1990.
- "Xerox touches off a price war." *Business Week*. 3 November 1975. P. 29
- Zito, Tom. "Style's the Thing in Rock as Art." *The Washington Post*. 26 November 1977.
- Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999.

WORKS CONSULTED

- Barlow, Aaron. *The Rise of the Blogosphere*. Connecticut: Praeger, 2007.
- Brewer, John. "Authors, Publishers and Literary Culture." *The Book History Reader*. Ed. David Finkelstein and Alistair McCleery. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- James VI and I. "A Speech to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament at White-Hall." *Divine Right and Democracy: An Anthology of Political Writing in Stuart England*. Ed. David Wooten. New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Littlefield, George Emory. *The Early Massachusetts Press 1638-1711*. New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.
- Morrissey, Lee. *The Constitution of Literature*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2008.
- Oswald, John Clyde. *Printing in the Americas*. New York: Gregg Publishing, 1937.
- Paine, Nathaniel. *A list of American Broadsides Belonging to the American Antiquarian Society*. Worcester: Charles Hamilton, 1897.
- Stiegler, Bernard. *Technics and Time 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Trans. Richard Beardsworth. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.